arXiv:1207.4360v1 [math.CV] 18 Jul 2012

ON THE QUASISYMMETRY OF QUASICONFORMAL MAPPINGS AND ITS APPLICATIONS

M. HUANG, S. PONNUSAMY, A. RASILA[†], AND X. WANG

Abstract. Suppose that D is a proper domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and that f is a quasiconformal mapping from D onto a John domain D' in $\mathbb{R}^n$. First, we show that if D and D' are bounded, and D is a broad domain, then for an arcwise connected subset A in D, $f(A)$ is LLC_2 with respect to $\delta_{D'}$ in D' if and only if the restriction $f|_A : A \to f(A)$ is quasisymmetric in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$. This result implies that the answer to one of the open problems raised by Heinonen from 1989 is affirmative under the additional condition "A being arcwise connected". By using the result obtained, we establish nine equivalent conditions for the domain quasiconformally equivalent to a uniform domain to be John. This result is a generalization of the main result in [12]. Based on the equivalent conditions to be John, we prove that if f is a quasiconformal mapping from a bounded uniform domain onto a bounded John domain, then f is uniformly Hölder continuous, which is a generalization of a result of Näkki and Palka [26].

1. Introduction and main results

In this paper, we study the quasisymmetry of quasiconformal mappings in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the applications of this property. The motivation for this study stems from one of Heinonen's open problems together with the main result, namely, Theorem 3.1 in [12]. Under the assumptions (1) both domains D and D' in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are bounded; (2) $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping; (3) D is φ-broad (see Definition 5), Heinonen concluded that (i) the restriction $f|_A : A \to f(A)$ is weakly H-quasisymmetric (see Definition 6) in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$ if $A \subset D$ is such that $f(A)$ is b-LLC_2 (see Definition 7) with respect to $\delta_{D'}$ in D' ([12, Theorem 6.1], see also Theorem O below). This is a generalization of a result of Väisälä [34, Theorem 2.20]; (ii) $f(A) = A'$ is b-LLC_2 with respect to $\delta_{D'}$ in D' provided $A \subset D$ is arcwise connected and $f^{-1}|_{A'} : A' \to A$ is weakly H-quasisymmetric in the metrics $\delta_{D'}$ and δ_D ([13, Lemma 8.3], see also Theorem P below). In [12], Heinonen asked whether the word "weakly" in the conclusion "$f|_A : A \to f(A)$ being weakly H-quasisymmetric in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$" is redundant (see the paragraph next to the statement of Theorem 6.5 in [12]). In the first part of this paper, we study this problem. Our result is as follows.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 30C65, 30F45; Secondary: 30C20.

Key words and phrases. Uniform domain, broad domain, John domain, quasiconformal mapping, quasisymmetry.

[†] `Corresponding author`.

File: H-Conj˙final.tex, printed: 2012-7-19, 0.15.

The research was partly supported by NSFs of China (No. 11071063 and No. 11101138).

Theorem 1. *Suppose that D and D' are bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that $f : D \to D'$ is K-quasiconformal, and let D be φ-broad. If $A \subset D$ is arcwise connected, then $f(A)$ is b-LLC$_2$ with respect to $\delta_{D'}$ in D' if and only if $f|_A : A \to f(A)$ is η-quasisymmetric in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$ with η depending only on the data*

$$\mu = \mu\left(n, K, b, \varphi, \frac{\delta_D(A)}{d_D(x_0)}, \frac{\delta_{D'}(f(A))}{d_{D'}(f(x_0))}\right),$$

where x_0 is a fixed point in A and $\delta_D(A)$ denotes the δ_D-diameter of A.

Remark 1. (1) Theorem 1 shows that the answer to Heinonen's problem mentioned as above is affirmative when the set A is arcwise connected.

(2) By Remark 2 in Section 2, we see that Theorem 1 is a generalization of [12, Theorem 6.6]. In fact, Theorem 1 shows that the conditions “A being BT” and “D' being BT” in [12, Theorem 6.6] are redundant.

The following result easily follows from Theorems 1, O and P.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping onto a φ-broad D' and that A is an arcwise connected subset of D. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. *A is c-LLC$_2$ with respect to δ_D in D;*
2. *$f|_A : A \to A'$ is weakly H-quasisymmetric in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$;*
3. *$f|_A : A \to f(A)$ is η-quasisymmetric in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$,*

where c, H and η depend on each other and the data

$$\mu = \mu\left(n, K, b, \varphi, \frac{\delta_D(A)}{d_D(x_0)}, \frac{\delta_{D'}(f(A))}{d_{D'}(f(x_0))}\right).$$

John [19], Martio and Sarvas [25] were the first who studied John domains and uniform domains, respectively. There are many alternative characterizations for uniform and John domains, see [6, 7, 9, 22, 24, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40]. The importance of this class of domains in the function theory is well documented, see [7, 22, 27, 32]. Moreover, John domains and uniform domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ enjoy numerous geometric and function theoretic features in many areas of modern mathematical analysis, see [1, 3, 6, 9, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 32, 39]. From the various equivalent characterizations, we adopt the following definitions.

Definition 1. A domain D in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be *c-uniform* if there exists a constant c with the property that each pair of points z_1, z_2 in D can be joined by a rectifiable arc γ in D satisfying (cf. [25, 36])

1. $\min\limits_{j=1,2} \ell(\gamma[z_j, z]) \le c\, d_D(z)$ for all $z \in \gamma$, and
2. $\ell(\gamma) \le c\, |z_1 - z_2|$,

where $\ell(\gamma)$ denotes the arc length of γ, $\gamma[z_j, z]$ the part of γ between z_j and z, and $d_D(z)$ is the distance from z to the boundary ∂D of D. Also we say that γ is a *double c-cone arc.*

A domain D in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a *c-John domain* if it satisfies the condition (1) in Definition 1, but not necessarily (2), and γ is called a *c-cone arc.*

Definition 2. A domain D in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is said to have the *c-carrot property* with center $x_0 \in \overline{D}$ if there exists a constant c with the property that for each point z_1 in A, z_1 and x_0 can be joined by a rectifiable arc γ in D satisfying (cf. [27, 34])

$$\ell(\gamma[z_1, z]) \leq c\, d_D(z)$$

for all $z \in \gamma$. Also we say that γ is a *c-carrot arc.*

A domain D in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^n$ is said to be a *c-John domain with center x_0 in $\overline{D}$* if it has the c-carrot property with center $x_0 \in \overline{D}$.

Definition 2 is often referred to as the "arc length" definition for the carrot property. When the word "arc length" in Definition 2 is replaced by "diameter", then it is called the "diameter" definition for the carrot property. The following result reveals the close relationship between these two definitions.

Theorem A. ([27]) *The "arc length" definition for the carrot property is quantitatively equivalent to the "diameter" one.*

Also the following result concerning the definitions for John domains in Definitions 1 and 2 is known to be equivalent.

Theorem B. ([34, Lemma 2.4]) *The definitions for John domains in Definitions 1 and 2 are quantitatively equivalent for bounded domains.*

In [12], Heinonen studied the quasiconformal mappings of the unit ball $\mathbb{B}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto John domains D in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The main aim of the paper of Heinonen [12] was to provide nine equivalent conditions for D to be John, where D is bounded and quasiconformally equivalent to $\mathbb{B}$, see [12, Theorem 3.1]. In addition, Heinonen specially pointed out that the requirement "D is quasiconformally equivalent to $\mathbb{B}$" in [12, Theorem 3.1] cannot be replaced e.g. by "D is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{B}$" or "D is a John domain". Based on Theorem 1, we will actually prove Theorem 2 below, which shows that the ball "$\mathbb{B}$" in the requirement "D being quasiconformally equivalent to $\mathbb{B}$" in [12, Theorem 3.1] can be replaced by "D being a uniform domain". We remark that every ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is uniform. Also, Theorem 2 is a generalization of Theorem 1 of Pommerenke [28]. To state the result, some notations are needed: Suppose D is c-uniform. For $x \in D$, we use $\Phi(x)$ to denote the set of all continua $I(x)$ in the intersection $\mathbb{B}(x, 8cd_D(x)) \cap \partial D$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(I(x)) \geq d_D(x)$. Obviously, $\Phi(x) \neq \emptyset$ for each $x \in D$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that D and D' are bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that $f:\ D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping, that D is c-uniform, and that $f: \overline{D} \to \overline{D'}$ is a homeomorphism. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *D' is a b-John domain with center $f(x_0)$;*
(2) *D' is φ-broad;*
(3) *$f: (D, \delta_D) \to (D', \delta_{D'})$ is η-quasisymmetric;*
(4) *For $x \in D$ and each $I(x) \in \Phi(x)$, $\mathrm{diam}\big(f(I(x))\big) \leq b_1 d_{D'}(f(x))$;*
(5) *For $x, w \in D$, if $|x - w| \leq 8cd_D(x)$, then $\delta_{D'}(f(x), f(w)) \leq b_2 d_{D'}(f(x))$;*

(6) *For $x, w \in D$, if $|x-w| \le 8cd_D(x)$ and $d_D(w) \le 2cd_D(x)$, then*

$$a_f(w) \le b_3 a_f(x)\Big(\frac{d(x)}{d(w)}\Big)^{1-\alpha}$$

(see Definition 9 for a_f);

(7) $\dfrac{\operatorname{diam}(f(P))}{\operatorname{diam}(f(Q))} \le b_4\Big(\dfrac{\operatorname{diam}(P)}{\operatorname{diam}(Q)}\Big)^{\alpha}$ *for all continua $P \subset Q \subset \partial D$;*

(8) *D' is b_5-LLC$_2$;*

(9) *D' is b_6-LLC$_2$ with respect to $\delta_{D'}$;*

(10) *$f : (D, \delta_D) \to (D', \delta_{D'})$ is weakly H-quasisymmetric.*

The constants b, b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5, b_6, α and the functions φ, η depend only on each other and the data

$$v = v\Big(c, n, k, \frac{\operatorname{diam}(D)}{d_D(x_0)}, \frac{\operatorname{diam}(D')}{d_{D'}(f(x_0))}\Big),$$

where x_0 is a fixed point in D.

Definition 3. A mapping f of a set A in a metric space (X_1, d_1) into another metric space (X_2, d_2) is said to be *Hölder continuous* with exponent $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ at a point x in A if there is a constant M such that

$$d_2(f(x), f(y)) \le M d_1(x, y)^{\alpha} \tag{1.1}$$

for all y in A. Further, if (1.1) holds for all points x and y in A with fixed M and α, then we say that f is *uniformly Hölder continuous* with exponent α in A or that f belongs to the Lipschitz class in A with exponent α. We use the notation $\operatorname{Lip}_{\alpha}(A)$ to denote this class.

In [26], Näkki and Palka proved that each quasiconformal mapping f of a bounded uniform domain D in $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto the ball $\mathbb{B}$ belongs to $\operatorname{Lip}_{\alpha}(D)$ and f^{-1} belongs to $\operatorname{Lip}_{\beta}(\mathbb{B})$, where the constants $\alpha \le 1$ and $\beta \le 1$ depend only on the outer dilation of f, the uniformality coefficient of D and the dimension n ([26, Theorem 10]). The following result is a version of [35, Theorem 5.19] in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem C. *Suppose that $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping. Then f satisfies the Hölder condition*

$$\frac{|z_1' - z_2'|}{d_{D'}(z_1')} \le b_0\Big(\frac{|z_1 - z_2|}{d_D(z_1)}\Big)^{a_1}$$

for all $z_1 \in D$ and $z_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}(z_1, \frac{1}{2}d_D(z_1))$, where the constants $b_0 \ge 1$ and $a_1 \in (0, 1]$ depend only on K and n.

As the third aim of this paper, we will exploit Theorem 2 to further investigate the Hölder continuity of quasiconformal mappings.

Theorem 3. *Let D and D' be bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that D is a c-uniform domain, that D' is a c_1-John domain, and suppose that $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping. Then f belongs to $\operatorname{Lip}_{\alpha}(D)$, where $\alpha = \alpha(c, c_1, K, n) \le 1$.*

The following corollary easily follows from Theorem 3.

Corollary 2. *Let D and D' be bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that D is a c-uniform domain and D' is a c_1-uniform domain, and suppose that $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping. Then f belongs to* $\mathrm{Lip}_\alpha(D)$ *and f^{-1} belongs to* $\mathrm{Lip}_\alpha(D')$*, where $\alpha = \alpha(c, c_1, K, n) \leq 1$.*

We remark that Theorem 3 shows that for the assertion "$f \in \mathrm{Lip}_\alpha(D)$", the ball "$\mathbb{B}$" in the assumption of [26, Theorem 10] can be replaced by "a John domain". Also Corollary 2 shows that the ball "$\mathbb{B}$" in the assumption of [26, Theorem 10] can be replaced by "a uniform domain".

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will record some notations, definitions and known results that are needed for a later discussion. The proofs of Theorems 1 $\sim$ 3 will be presented in Sections 3 $\sim$ 5, respectively.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Notation.** Throughout the paper, we always assume that D and D' are proper subdomains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, and $f : D \to D'$ includes the assumption that f is a homeomorphism onto D'. Also we use $\mathbb{B}(x_0, r)$ to denote the open ball $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < r\}$ centered at x_0 with radius $r > 0$. Similarly, for the closed balls and spheres, we use the notations $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(x_0, r)$ and $\mathbb{S}(x_0, r)$, respectively. In particular, we use $\mathbb{B}$ to denote the unit ball $\mathbb{B}(0, 1)$.

For convenience, in what follows, we always assume that $x, y, z, \ldots$ are points in a domain D in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the primes $x', y', z', \ldots$ the images in D' of $x, y, z, \ldots$ under f, respectively. Also we assume that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ are curves in D and the primes $\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \ldots$ the images in D' of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ under f, respectively.

2.2. **Quasihyperbolic metric, solid arcs and neargeodesics.** Let γ be a rectifiable arc or path in D. Then the *quasihyperbolic length* of γ is defined to be the number $\ell_{k_D}(\gamma)$ given by (cf. [10])

$$\ell_{k_D}(\gamma) = \int_\gamma \frac{|dz|}{d_D(z)}.$$

For z_1, z_2 in D, the *quasihyperbolic distance* $k_D(z_1, z_2)$ between z_1 and z_2 is defined in the usual way:

$$k_D(z_1, z_2) = \inf \ell_{k_D}(\gamma),$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable arcs γ joining z_1 to z_2 in D. An arc γ from z_1 to z_2 is called a *quasihyperbolic geodesic* if $\ell_{k_D}(\gamma) = k_D(z_1, z_2)$. Each subarc of a quasihyperbolic geodesic is obviously a quasihyperbolic geodesic. It is known that a quasihyperbolic geodesic between two points in D always exists (cf. [9, Lemma 1]). Moreover, for z_1, z_2 in D, we have (cf. [36, 42])

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \qquad k_D(z_1, z_2) &\geq \inf_\gamma \log\left(1 + \frac{\ell(\gamma)}{\min\{d_D(z_1), d_D(z_2)\}}\right) \\ &\geq \log\left(1 + \frac{|z_1 - z_2|}{\min\{d_D(z_1), d_D(z_2)\}}\right) \geq \left|\log\frac{d_D(z_2)}{d_D(z_1)}\right|, \end{aligned}$$

where γ denote rectifiable curves joining z_1 and z_2 in D. In particular, it follows that for every quasigeodesic γ in D joining z_1 to z_2,

$$k_D(z_1, z_2) \geq \log\left(1 + \frac{\ell(\gamma)}{\min\{d_D(z_1), d_D(z_2)\}}\right). \tag{2.2}$$

Furthermore, if $|z_1 - z_2| \leq d_D(z_1)$, then we have (cf. [35, 41])

$$k_D(z_1, z_2) \leq \log\Big(1 + \frac{|z_1 - z_2|}{d_D(z_1) - |z_1 - z_2|}\Big). \tag{2.3}$$

The following characterization of uniform domains by the quasihyperbolic metric is useful for our discussions.

Theorem D. ([41, 2.50 (2)]) *A domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is c-uniform if and only if there is a constant μ_1 such that for all x, $y \in D$,*

$$k_D(x, y) \leq \mu_1 \log\left(1 + \frac{|x - y|}{\min\{d_D(x), d_D(y)\}}\right),$$

where $\mu_1 = \mu_1(c)$ is a constant depending only on c.

This form of the definition of uniform domains is due to Gehring and Osgood [9]. As a matter of fact, in [9, Theorem 1], there was an additive constant in the inequality of Theorem D, but it was shown by Vuorinen in [41, 2.50 (2)] that the additive constant can be chosen to be zero.

Next, we recall a relationship between the quasihyperbolic distance of points in D and the one of their images in D' under a quasiconformal mapping.

Theorem E. ([9, Theorem 3]) *Suppose $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping. Then for z_1, $z_2 \in D$,*

$$k_{D'}(z_1', z_2') \leq \mu_2 \max\left\{k_D(z_1, z_2), (k_D(z_1, z_2))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\right\},$$

where the constant $\mu_2 = \mu_2(n, K) \geq 1$ depends only on K and n.

As a generalization of quasihyperbolic geodesics, Väisälä introduced the concept of neargeodesic in [38].

Definition 4. An arc $\alpha \subset D$ is a *ν-neargeodesic* if $\ell_{k_D}(\alpha[x, y]) \leq \nu\, k_D(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \alpha$.

Obviously, a ν-neargeodesic is a quasihyperbolic geodesic if and only if $\nu = 1$. The following result is the version of [38, Theorem 6.19] in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem F. *Suppose that D is a c-uniform domain and that γ is a c_1-neargeodesic in D with endpoints z_1 and z_2. Then there is a constant $\mu_3 = \mu_3(c, c_1) \geq 1$ such that*

(1) $\min\limits_{j=1,2} \ell(\gamma[z_j, z]) \leq \mu_3\, d_D(z)$ *for all $z \in \alpha$; and*
(2) $\ell(\gamma) \leq \mu_3\, |z_1 - z_2|$.

2.3. **Moduli of families of curves.** Suppose that G is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that E and F are two disjoint continua in G, and that $\operatorname{Mod}(E,F;G)$ denotes the usual conformal modulus of the family of all curves joining E and F in G. For a family of curves Γ in G, we always use $\operatorname{Mod}(\Gamma)$ to denote the conformal modulus of Γ [31]. The following related results are useful for us. The first result is from [16, p. 397] or the combination of §11.9 in [31], [41, Lemmas 2.39 and 2.44] and §7 in [42].

Theorem G. *Suppose $n \geq 2$. Then there exist decreasing homeomorphisms ϕ_n, $\psi_n : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that*

$$\phi_n(t) \leq \operatorname{Mod}(E,F;\mathbb{R}^n) \leq \psi_n(t),$$

where $t = \frac{\operatorname{dist}(E,F)}{\min\{\operatorname{diam}E,\operatorname{diam}F\}}$ and "dist" (resp. "diam") is "distance" (resp. "diameter").

Theorem H. ([8, Theorem 4.15] and [16, p. 397]) *Suppose that $G \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a c-uniform domain. Then*

$$\operatorname{Mod}(E,F;\mathbb{R}^n) \leq \mu_4 \operatorname{Mod}(E,F;G)$$

for every pair of disjoint continua E and F in G, where $\mu_4 = \mu_4(n,c)$ is a constant depending only on n and c.

Theorem I. ([31, Theorem 7.1] *and* [33, Lemma 2.9]) (1) *There is a decreasing homeomorphism $\varrho_n : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ with the following property: if Γ is a family of paths, each of which meets a set E in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and has length at least λ, then*

$$\operatorname{Mod}(\Gamma) \leq \varrho_n\Big(\frac{\lambda}{\operatorname{diam}(E)}\Big).$$

(2) *Suppose that a family of the curves Γ lie in a Borel set $E \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}^n$ and that $\ell(\gamma) \geq r > 0$ for every locally rectifiable $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Then*

$$\operatorname{Mod}_p(\Gamma) \leq \frac{m(E)}{r^p},$$

where $m(E)$ denotes the volume of E.

Theorem J. ([31, Section 7.5]) *For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < a < b < \infty$, let A denote the spherical ring $\mathbb{B}^n(x,b)\backslash\overline{\mathbb{B}}^n(x,a)$, $E = \mathbb{S}^n(x,a)$, $F = \mathbb{S}^n(x,b)$ and $\Gamma_A = \Gamma(E,F,A)$ the family of the curves in A connecting E and F. Then*

$$\operatorname{Mod}(\Gamma_A) = \omega_{n-1}\Big(\log\frac{b}{a}\Big)^{1-n}.$$

2.4. **Internal metric, broad domains and quasisymmetric mappings.** For x, y in D, the internal metric δ_D in D is defined by

$$\delta_D(x,y) = \inf\{\operatorname{diam}(\alpha) :\ \alpha \subset D \text{ is a rectifiable arc joining } x \text{ and } y\}.$$

Definition 5. Let $\varphi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ be a decreasing homeomorphism. We say that D is *φ-broad* if for each $t > 0$ and each pair (C_0, C_1) of continua in D with $C_0 \cap C_1 = \emptyset$, the condition $\delta_D(C_0,C_1) \leq t \min\{\operatorname{diam}(C_0), \operatorname{diam}(C_1)\}$ implies

$$\operatorname{Mod}(C_0,C_1;D) \geq \varphi(t),$$

where $\delta_D(C_0, C_1)$ denotes the δ_D-distance between C_0 and C_1.

Broad domains were introduced in [34]. It was later proved that a simply connected planar domain is broad if and only if it is John [27, Section 8]. Further, Gehring and Martio proved the following.

Theorem K. ([8, Lemma 2.6]) *If $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a c-uniform domain, then D is φ-broad, where φ depends only on c.*

Definition 6. Let (X, d) and (X', d') be two metric spaces, and let $\eta : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ be a homeomorphism. An embedding $f : X \to X'$ is *η-quasisymmetric*, or briefly η-QS, in the metrics d and d' if $d(a, x) \leq td(a, y)$ implies

$$d'(a', x') \leq \eta(t)d'(a', y')$$

for all a, x, $y \in X$, and if there is a constant $\nu \geq 1$ such that $d(a, x) \leq d(a, y)$ implies

$$d'(a', x') \leq \nu d'(a', y'),$$

then f is said to be *weakly ν-quasisymmetric*, or briefly weakly ν-QS, in the metrics d and d'.

Obviously, “quasisymmetry” implies “weak quasisymmetry”.

Remark 2. It follows from [32] (see also [5]) that f^{-1} is η_1-quasisymmetric if f is η-quasisymmetric, where η_1 depends only on η.

Theorem L. ([27, Lemma 3.9]) *Suppose $f : D \to D'$ is a homeomorphism which is η-QS in the metrics e and e' with $d \leq e \leq \delta_D$ and $d' \leq e' \leq \delta_{D'}$, where $d = d'$ denotes the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^n$. If D is φ-broad, then D' is φ'-broad with φ' depending only on φ, η and n.*

Theorem M. ([27, Lemma 3.5]) *Suppose that D and D' are bounded and that $f : D \to D'$ is a homeomorphism which is η-QS in the metrics e and e' with $d \leq e \leq \delta_D$ and $d' \leq e' \leq \delta_{D'}$, where $d = d'$ denotes the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^n$. If D is a c-John domain, then D' is a c'-John domain with c' depending only on c, η and n.*

We record the following result which is from [34].

Theorem N. ([34, Theorem 2.20]) *Suppose that $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping between domains D and $D' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where D is ϕ-broad. Suppose also that $A \subset D$ is a arcwise connected set and that A' has the c_1-carrot property in D' with center $y'_0 \in \overline{D'}$. If $y'_0 \neq \infty$, we assume that* $\operatorname{diam}(A') \leq c_2 d_{D'}(y'_0)$. *If $y'_0 = \infty$, we assume that f extends to a homeomorphism $D \cup \{\infty\} \to D' \cup \{\infty\}$. Then $f|_A$ is η-QS in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$ with η depending only on the data $\nu = \nu(c_1, c_2, K, \phi, n)$.*

See [4, 14, 15, 30] etc for further discussions on the quasisymmetry of quasiconformal mappings.

2.5. **Linearly locally connected sets.**

Definition 7. Suppose that $A \subset D$ and $b \geq 1$ is a constant. We say that A is b-LLC_2 (resp. b-LLC_2 with respect to δ_D) in D if for all $x \in A$ and $r > 0$, the points in $A\backslash\overline{\mathbb{B}}(x, br)$ (resp. $A\backslash\overline{\mathbb{B}}_{\delta_D}(x, br)$) can be joined in $D\backslash\overline{\mathbb{B}}(x, r)$ (resp. $D\backslash\overline{\mathbb{B}}_{\delta_D}(x, r)$), where

$$\mathbb{B}_{\delta_D}(x, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ \delta_D(z, x) < r\}.$$

If $A = D$, then we say that D is b-LLC$_2$ (resp. b-LLC$_2$ with respect to δ_D).

We recall the following result which is from [12].

Theorem O. ([12, Theorem 6.1]) *Suppose that D and D' are bounded, that $f : D \to D'$ is K-quasiconformal, and suppose that D is φ-broad. If $A \subset D$ is such that $f(A)$ is* b-LLC$_2$ with respect to $\delta_{D'}$ in D', then $f|_A : A \to A'$ is weakly H-QS in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$ with H depending only on the data

$$\mu_5 = \mu_5\left(n, K, b, \varphi, \frac{\delta_D(A)}{d_D(x_0)}, \frac{\delta_D(A')}{d_{D'}(x_0')}\right),$$

where x_0 is a fixed point in A.

In [13], Heinonen considered the converse of Theorem O and obtained the following.

Theorem P. ([13, Lemma 8.3]) *Suppose that $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping onto a φ-broad D' and that A is an arcwise connected subset of D. If $f|_A : A \to A'$ is weakly H-QS in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$, then A is* c-LLC$_2$ with respect to δ_D in D, where c depends only on $\upsilon = (n, K, \varphi, H)$.

2.6. **κ-homogeneously totally bounded spaces.**

Definition 8. We say that a metric space X is *κ-homogeneously totally bounded* or briefly, *κ-HTB*, if $\kappa : [\frac{1}{2}, \infty) \to [1, \infty)$ is an increasing function and if, for each $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}$, each closed ball $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(x, r)$ in X can be covered with sets $A_1, \ldots, A_s$ such that $s \leq \kappa(\alpha)$ and $\mathrm{diam}(A_j) < \frac{r}{\alpha}$ for all j. (We always assume, in the following, that $\kappa(\alpha) \geq 2$.)

Theorem Q. ([34, Lemma 2.18]) *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a φ-broad domain, and let e be a metric of D with $d \leq e \leq \delta_D$, where d denotes the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then (D, e) is* κ-HTB *with $\kappa = \kappa_{\phi,n}$.*

2.7. **The function a_f.**

Definition 9. Suppose $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping. For $x \in D$, we write

$$B_x = \mathbb{B}\Big(x, \frac{1}{2}d_D(x)\Big)$$

and set

$$a_f(x) = \exp\Big(\frac{1}{nm(B_x)} \int_{B_x} \log J_f dm\Big),$$

where J_f denotes the Jacobian of f and $m(B_x)$ stands for the volume of the ball B_x.

We recall the following result concerning the function a_f.

Theorem R. ([12, Lemma 2.11], *see also* [2, Theorem 1.8]) *Suppose $f : D \to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping. Then there is a constant μ_6 such that*

$$\frac{1}{\mu_6}\frac{d_{D'}(x')}{d_D(x)} \le a_f(x) \le \mu_6 \frac{d_{D'}(x')}{d_D(x)}$$

for all $x \in D$, where $\mu_6 = \mu_6(n, K)$ depends only on n and K.

3. Linear local connectedness and quasisymmetry

The aim of this section is to give a proof of Theorem 1. Before the proof of Theorem 1, we prove two lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that D and D' are bounded, that $f : D \to D'$ is K-quasiconformal, that D is φ-broad, and suppose that $A \subset D$ is arcwise connected such that $f|_A : A \to A'$ is weakly H-QS in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$. For $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in A$, if $\delta_D(z_1, z_3) \le c\delta_D(z_1, z_2)$, then*

$$\delta_{D'}(z_1', z_3') \le \mu_7 \delta_{D'}(z_1', z_2'),$$

where $\mu_7 = H(1 + H)\mu_8^{\kappa(c)-2}$,

$$\mu_8 = \max\Big\{8HK, 8H \exp\Big(2\big(\frac{2K\omega_{n-1}}{\varphi(\frac{45}{4})}\big)^{\frac{2}{n-1}}\Big) + 8H\Big\}$$

and the homeomorphism κ is the same as in Theorem Q.

Proof. If $\delta_D(z_1, z_2) \ge \delta_D(z_1, z_3)$, then by Theorem O,

$$\delta_D'(z_1', z_2') \ge \frac{1}{H}\delta_D'(z_1', z_3').$$

Hence the lemma holds in this case.

Next we consider the case when $\delta_D(z_1, z_2) < \delta_D(z_1, z_3)$. By Theorem Q, there must exist a finite sequence $\{u_1, \dots, u_q\}$ ($q \le \kappa(c)$) in D such that

$$\mathbb{B}_{\delta_D}(z_1, \delta_D(z_1, z_3)) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} \mathbb{B}_{\delta_D}(u_i, \frac{1}{2}\delta_D(z_1, z_2)),$$

where $u_1 = z_1$ and $u_q = z_3$.

We take β to be a Jordan curve joining z_1 and z_3 in A. Further, we let $x_1 = z_1$, and let $x_2, \dots, x_s$ be points such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, x_{i+1} denotes the last point in β along the direction from z_1 to z_3 such that

$$\delta_D(x_1, x_{i+1}) = 3^{i-1}\delta_D(z_1, z_2),$$

$$z_3 \in D\backslash \mathbb{B}_{\delta_D}(z_1, 3^{s-1}\delta_D(z_1, z_2)) \text{ and } z_3 \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta_D}(z_1, 3^{s}\delta_D(z_1, z_2)).$$

It is possible that $x_{s+1} = z_3$. Obviously,

$$3^{s-1}\delta_D(z_1, z_2) \le \delta_D(z_1, z_3) < 3^s\delta_D(z_1, z_2) \tag{3.1}$$

and for all $i \ne j \in \{1, \dots, s + 1\}$,

$$\delta_D(x_i, x_j) \ge 2\delta_D(z_1, z_2).$$

Then we have

$$s+1 \le q \le \kappa(c). \tag{3.2}$$

Let y_{s+1} be the first point in $\beta[z_3, x_s]$ along the direction from z_3 to x_s such that

$$\delta_D(z_3, y_{s+1}) = \frac{1}{8}\delta_D(x_s, z_3).$$

We infer from (3.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_D(x_s, y_{s+1}) &\le \delta_D(x_1, x_s) + \delta_D(x_1, z_3) + \delta_D(y_{s+1}, z_3) \\ &= \delta_D(x_1, x_s) + \delta_D(x_1, z_3) + \frac{1}{8}\delta_D(x_s, z_3) \\ &\le \frac{9}{8}\big(\delta_D(x_1, x_s) + \delta_D(x_1, z_3)\big) < \frac{45}{4}\delta_D(x_1, x_s) \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\delta_D(x_s, y_{s+1}) \le \delta_D(x_s, z_3) + \delta_D(y_{s+1}, z_3) = 9\delta_D(y_{s+1}, z_3). \tag{3.4}$$

Clearly, for each $w \in \beta[y_{s+1}, z_3]$,

$$\delta_D(y_{s+1}, w) \le \delta_D(y_{s+1}, z_3) + \delta_D(z_3, w) \le 2\delta_D(y_{s+1}, z_3).$$

It follows from

$$\delta_D(x_1, z_3) \ge \delta_D(x_s, z_3) - \delta_D(x_1, x_s) \ge \delta_D(x_s, z_3) - \frac{1}{3}\delta_D(x_1, z_3)$$

that

$$\delta_D(x_1, z_3) \ge \frac{3}{4}\delta_D(x_s, z_3),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_D(x_1, w) &\ge \delta_D(x_1, z_3) - \delta_D(w, z_3) \ge \frac{3}{4}\delta_D(x_s, z_3) - \delta_D(w, z_3) \\ &\ge 5\delta_D(y_{s+1}, z_3) \ge \frac{5}{2}\delta_D(y_{s+1}, w). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Now we take $v_i = x_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$, $v_{s+1} = y_{s+1}$ and $v_{s+2} = z_3$. For each $i \in \{2, \ldots, s-1\}$, we have

$$\delta_D(v_i, v_{i+1}) \le \delta_D(v_1, v_i) + \delta_D(v_1, v_{i+1}) = 4\delta_D(v_1, v_i),$$

and further

$$\delta_D(v_i, v_{i+1}) \le 4\delta_D(v_1, v_i) = \frac{4}{3}\delta_D(v_1, v_{i+1}) \le \frac{2}{3}\delta_D(v_{i+1}, v_{s+2}),$$

since by (3.1), $\delta_D(v_{i+1}, v_{s+2}) \ge \delta_D(v_1, v_{s+2}) - \delta_D(v_1, v_{i+1}) \ge 2\delta_D(v_1, v_{i+1})$. Then (3.3) and (3.4) show that for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, s\}$,

$$\delta_D(v_i, v_{i+1}) \le \frac{45}{4}\min\{\delta_D(v_1, v_i), \delta_D(v_{i+1}, v_{s+2})\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Claim 3.1. (1) *For each* $i \in \{2, \ldots, s\}$, *we have* $\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_{i+1}) \le \mu_8 \delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i)$; *and* (2) $\delta_{D'}(v'_{s+1}, v'_{s+2}) \le H\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_{s+1})$.

We prove the part (1) by contradiction. Suppose on the contrary that there exists an $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$ such that

$$\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_{i+1}) > \mu_8 \delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i).$$

Let γ'_i be a Jordan curve joining v'_1 and v'_i in D' such that

$$\operatorname{diam}(\gamma'_i) < \frac{5}{4}\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i), \tag{3.7}$$

and we let w'_i be the last point in $\beta'[v'_i, v'_{s+2}]$ along the direction from v'_i to v'_{s+2} such that

$$\delta_{D'}(v'_1, w'_i) = \frac{\mu_8}{3H}\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i).$$

Obviously,

$$\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_{i+1}) \geq 3H\delta_{D'}(v'_1, w'_i). \tag{3.8}$$

Moreover, we have

Subclaim 1. $w'_i \in \beta'[v'_i, v'_{i+1}]$.

To prove this subclaim, we divide the arguments into the case when $i \leq s-1$ and the case when $i = s$. We first consider the case $i \leq s-1$. Then Theorem O and (3.8) imply

$$\delta_D(v_1, v_{i+1}) > \delta_D(v_1, w_i),$$

and so the choice of v_{i+1} shows that $w'_i \in \beta'[v'_i, v'_{i+1}]$.

On the other hand, we consider the case $i = s$. On the contrary, we suppose that $w'_s \in \beta'[v'_{s+1}, v'_{s+2}]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{D'}(v'_{s+1}, w'_s) &\geq \delta_{D'}(v'_s, v'_{s+1}) - \delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_s) - \delta_{D'}(v'_1, w'_s)\\ &\geq \delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_{s+1}) - 2\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_s) - \delta_{D'}(v'_1, w'_s)\\ &\geq \Big(\mu_8 - 2 - \frac{\mu_8}{3H}\Big)\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_s) > H\delta_{D'}(v'_1, w'_s).\end{aligned}$$

Hence Theorem O shows

$$\delta_D(v_{s+1}, w_s) \geq \delta_D(v_1, w_s),$$

which contradicts with (3.5). Hence Subclaim 1 is also true in this case. The proof of the subclaim is complete.

We come back to the proof of the part (1) in Claim 3.1. For each $w' \in \gamma'_i$ and $z' \in \beta'[w'_i, v'_{s+2}]$, we have from (3.7) and the choice of w'_i that

$$\delta_{D'}(w', z') \geq \delta_{D'}(v'_1, z') - \delta_{D'}(v'_1, w') \geq \Big(\frac{\mu_8}{3H} - \frac{5}{4}\Big)\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i). \tag{3.9}$$

It also follows from (3.6) and Subclaim 1 that for each $i \in \{2, \dots, s\}$,

$$\delta_D(\gamma_i, \beta[w_i, v_{s+2}]) \leq \delta_D(v_i, v_{i+1}) \leq \frac{45}{4}\min\{\operatorname{diam}(\gamma_i), \operatorname{diam}(\beta[w_i, v_{s+2}])\}.$$

Then we see that

$$\operatorname{Mod}(\gamma_i, \beta[w_i, v_{s+2}]; D) \geq \varphi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(\gamma_i, \beta[w_i, v_{s+2}])}{t_i}\Big) \geq \varphi(\frac{45}{4}), \tag{3.10}$$

where $t_i = \min\{\mathrm{diam}(\gamma_i), \mathrm{diam}(\beta[w_i, v_{s+2}])\}$.

Let

$$\Upsilon'_{1i} = \{\eta' : \eta' \subset \mathbb{B}\big(v'_i, (\frac{\mu_8}{4H})^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i)\big)\}$$

and

$$\Upsilon'_{2i} = \{\eta' : \eta' \cap \mathbb{S}\big(v'_i, (\frac{\mu_8}{4H})^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i)\big) \neq \emptyset\},$$

where η' denote the curves joining γ'_i and $\beta'[w'_i, v'_{s+2}]$ in D'. It follows from Theorems I and J, (3.9) and (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi(\frac{45}{4})}{K} &\leq \frac{1}{K}\mathrm{Mod}(\gamma_i, \beta[w_i, v_{s+2}]; D) \leq \mathrm{Mod}(\gamma'_i, \beta'[w'_i, v'_{s+2}]; D') \\ &\leq \mathrm{Mod}(\Upsilon'_{1i}) + \mathrm{Mod}(\Upsilon'_{2i}) \leq \omega_{n-1}\left(\frac{(\frac{\mu_8}{4H})^{\frac{n}{2}}}{(\frac{\mu_8}{3H} - \frac{5}{4})^n} + \Big(\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{4\mu_4}{25H}\Big)^{1-n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since by (3.7), we obtain that for each $\gamma' \in \Upsilon'_{2i}$, $\gamma' \cap \mathbb{S}\big(v'_i, \frac{5}{4}\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_i)\big) \neq \emptyset$. This is the desired contradiction, which implies that the part (1) in Claim 3.1 is true.

The proof for the part (2) in Claim 3.1 easily follows from (3.5) and Theorem O. The proof of Claim 3.1 is complete.

By Claim 3.1 and Theorem O, we see that

$$\delta_{D'}(z'_1, z'_2) \geq \frac{1}{H}\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_2) \geq \frac{1}{\mu_8 H}\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_3) \geq \frac{1}{\mu_8^{s-1} H}\delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_{s+1}),$$

and so (3.2) and (2) in Claim 3.1 yield

$$\delta_{D'}(z'_1, z'_3) \leq \delta_{D'}(v'_1, v'_{s+1}) + \delta_{D'}(v'_{s+1}, v'_{s+2}) \leq H(1+H)\mu_8^{\kappa(c)-2}\delta_{D'}(z'_1, z'_2),$$

from which the proof of the lemma follows. □

Lemma 2. *Suppose that D and D' are bounded, that $f : D \to D'$ is K-quasiconformal, and suppose that D is φ-broad. If $A \subset D$ is arcwise connected such that $f|_A : A \to A'$ is weakly H-QS in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$, then $\delta_D(a, x) \leq \delta_D(a, y)$ implies*

$$\frac{\delta_{D'}(a', x')}{\delta_{D'}(a', y')} \leq \psi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(a, x)}{\delta_D(a, y)}\Big)$$

for all a, x, $y \in A$, where $\psi : (0, 1] \to (0, +\infty)$ is an increasing homeomorphism which depends only on the data

$$\mu_9 = \mu_9\left(n, K, b, \varphi, \frac{\delta_D(A)}{d_D(x_0)}, \frac{\delta_D(A')}{d_{D'}(x'_0)}\right),$$

and x_0 is a fixed point in A.

Proof. Let $\mu_{10} = \exp(4\mu_{11})$ and

$$\mu_{11} = \max\Big\{6^3 K, \varrho_n^{-1}(\frac{\varphi(6)}{8}), \exp\Big((\frac{8K\omega_{n-1}}{\varphi(6)})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\Big)\Big\}.$$

For a proof, we let a, x and $y \in A$. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$\delta_D(a, y) \geq \delta_D(a, x).$$

Write $r = \frac{\delta_D(a,y)}{\delta_D(a,x)}$ and $s = \frac{\delta_{D'}(a',y')}{\delta_{D'}(a',x')}$. Obviously, $r \geq 1$. We consider the case where $r \leq 4\mu_{11}^2$ and the case where $r > 4\mu_{11}^2$, separately. For each case, we will construct an increasing homeomorphism. The desired homeomorphism will be got from the obtained ones.

Suppose first that $r \leq 4\mu_{11}^2$. Then by Theorem O, we have

$$\frac{\delta_{D'}(a',x')}{\delta_{D'}(a',y')} \leq 4H\mu_{11}^2 \frac{\delta_D(a,x)}{\delta_D(a,y)}.$$

In this case we let

$$\psi_1(t) = 4H\mu_{11}^2 t \tag{3.11}$$

for t in $[\frac{1}{4\mu_{11}^2}, 1]$.

Suppose next that $r > 4\mu_{11}^2$. Then we let α be a curve joining a and y in A. We let $x_1 = a$, and let $x_2, \ldots, x_{t+1}$ be points such that for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$, x_{i+1} denotes the first point in α along the direction from a to y such that

$$\delta_D(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 6^i \delta_D(a,x) \text{ and } \delta_D(x_{t+1}, y) < 6\delta_D(x_t, x_{t+1}). \tag{3.12}$$

It is possible that $x_{t+1} = y$. Clearly,

$$\sum_{i=2}^{t+1} \delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) = \frac{6}{5}\Big(\delta_D(x_t, x_{t+1}) - \delta_D(a,x)\Big).$$

Then

$$\delta_D(a,y) \leq \sum_{i=2}^{t+1} \delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) + \delta_D(x_{t+1}, y) < \frac{36}{5}\delta_D(x_t, x_{t+1})$$

and

$$\sum_{i=2}^{t+1} \delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) \geq \Big(\frac{1}{6} - \frac{3}{10\mu_{11}^2}\Big)\delta_D(a,y),$$

since the assumption implies that $\frac{\delta_D(a,y)}{\delta_D(a,x)} > 4\mu_{11}^2$. Hence we see

$$t > \log_6(4r) - 2. \tag{3.13}$$

It follows from (3.12) that for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, t\}$,

$$\sum_{j=2}^{i} \delta_D(x_{j-1}, x_j) < \frac{1}{5}\delta_D(x_i, x_{i+1}), \tag{3.14}$$

and so by Theorem O,

$$\delta_{D'}(x_i', x_{i+1}') \geq \frac{1}{H}\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_i').$$

From (3.14), we have

$$\delta_D(x_j, x_i) \geq \delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) - \delta_D(x_j, x_{i-1}) \geq \frac{4}{5}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) \tag{3.15}$$

for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, i-1\}$.

For each $i \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, we let

$$B_i = \mathbb{B}\Big(x_i, \frac{\mu_{11}}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i)\Big) \text{ and } C_i = \mathbb{B}_{\delta_D}\Big(x_i, \frac{1}{\mu_{10}}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i)\Big).$$

It follows from (3.15) that for all $i \neq j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$,

$$\delta_D(x_i, x_j) \geq \frac{4}{5}\max\{\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i), \delta_D(x_{j-1}, x_j)\} \geq \frac{2}{5}\mu_{10}\max\{\delta_D(C_i), \delta_D(C_j)\},$$

whence

$$C_i \cap C_j = \emptyset. \tag{3.16}$$

For each $i \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, let y_i (resp. v_i) denote the first point in α along the direction from x_i to x_{i+1} (resp. from y_i to x_{i+1}) such that

$$\delta_D(x_i, y_i) = \frac{1}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) \ \big(\text{resp. } \delta_D(x_i, v_i) = \frac{6}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i)\big), \tag{3.17}$$

and let w_i be the first point in α along the direction from v_i to x_{i+1} such that

$$\delta_D(v_i, w_i) = \frac{1}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i). \tag{3.18}$$

We obtain from (3.14) that

$$\delta_D(x_1, x_i) \leq \delta_D(x_1, x_{i-1}) + \delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) \leq \frac{6}{5}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i)$$

and

$$\delta_D(x_1, x_i) \geq \delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i) - \delta_D(x_1, x_{i-1}) \geq \frac{4}{5}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i)$$

Then

$$\delta_D(x_i, y_i) \geq \frac{5}{6\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_1, x_i) \geq \frac{5}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(a, x),$$

and so Lemma 1 and Theorem O imply

$$\delta_{D'}(x'_1, x'_i) \leq \frac{(1+H)H\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})}}{\mu_8^2}\delta_{D'}(x'_i, y'_i) \text{ and } \delta_{D'}(a', x') \leq H\delta_{D'}(x'_1, x'_i). \tag{3.19}$$

For all $w \in \alpha[x_i, y_i]$ and $z \in \alpha[v_i, w_i]$, the choice of y_i and w_i implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_D(w, z) &\geq \delta_D(x_i, z) - \delta_D(x_i, w) \\ &\geq \delta_D(x_i, v_i) - \delta_D(v_i, z) - \delta_D(x_i, w) \geq \frac{4}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i). \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

As a consequence, we see that $\alpha[x_i, y_i] \cap \alpha[v_i, w_i] = \emptyset$. From (3.17) and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Mod}(\alpha[x_i, y_i], \alpha[v_i, w_i]; D) &\geq \varphi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(\alpha[x_i, y_i], \alpha[v_i, w_i])}{t_i}\Big) \\ &\geq \varphi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x_i, v_i)}{t_i}\Big) \geq \varphi(6), \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where $t_i = \min\{\mathrm{diam}(\alpha[x_i, y_i]), \mathrm{diam}(\alpha[v_i, w_i])\}$. Let

$$\Gamma_{0i} = \{\gamma : \gamma \subset B_i \cap C_i\}, \ \ \Gamma_{1i} = \{\gamma : \gamma \subset B_i - B_i \cap C_i\}$$

and

$$\Gamma_{2i} = \{\gamma : \gamma \cap \partial B_i \neq \emptyset\},$$

where γ denote the curves joining $\alpha[x_i, y_i]$ and $\alpha[v_i, w_i]$ in D.

It follows from (3.17), (3.18), (3.20), (3.21), Theorems I and J that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(6) &\leq \mathrm{Mod}(\alpha[x_i, y_i], \alpha[v_i, w_i]; D) \leq \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma_{0i}) + \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma_{1i}) + \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma_{2i}) \\ &\leq \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma_{0i}) + \varrho_n\big(\frac{\mu_{10} - 1}{2\mu_{11}}\big) + \omega_{n-1}(\log \mu_{11})^{1-n},\end{aligned}$$

since for each $\gamma \in \Gamma_{2i}$, $\gamma \cap \mathbb{S}\big(x_i, \frac{1}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i)\big) \neq \emptyset$. We deduce that

$$\mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma'_{0i}) \geq \frac{1}{K}\mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma_{0i}) \geq \frac{3}{4K}\varphi(6). \tag{3.22}$$

For all $w \in \alpha[x_i, y_i]$ and $z \in \alpha[v_i, w_i]$, since

$$\delta_D(x_i, w) \leq \frac{1}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i)$$

and

$$\delta_D(w, y_i) \leq \delta_D(x_i, w) + \delta_D(x_i, y_i) \leq \frac{2}{\mu_{10}^2}\delta_D(x_{i-1}, x_i),$$

we infer from (3.20) that

$$\delta_D(w, z) > \max\{\delta_D(x_i, w), \delta_D(w, y_i)\}.$$

Then (3.19) shows

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{D'}(w', z') &\geq \frac{1}{H}\max\{4\delta_{D'}(x'_i, w'), 2\delta_{D'}(w', y'_i)\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2H}\delta_{D'}(x'_i, y'_i) \geq \frac{1}{2(1+H)H^3\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})-2}}\delta_{D'}(a', x').\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Let

$$\Gamma'_{0i_1} = \{\gamma' : \gamma' \subset \Gamma'_{0i} \cap \mathbb{B}(x'_i, \mu_{11}\delta_{D'}(a', y'))\},$$
$$\Gamma'_{0i_2} = \{\gamma' : \gamma' \subset \Gamma'_{0i} \ \text{ and } \ \gamma' \cap \mathbb{S}(x'_i, \mu_{11}\delta_{D'}(a', y')) \neq \emptyset\}$$

and

$$B'_{1i} = B'_i \cap C'_i \cap \mathbb{B}(x'_i, \mu_{11}\delta_{D'}(a', y')).$$

Then (3.22) and Theorem J imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{3}{4K}\varphi(6) &\leq \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma'_{0i}) \leq \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma'_{0i_1}) + \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma'_{0i_2}) \\ &\leq \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma'_{0i_1}) + \omega_{n-1}(\log \mu_{11})^{1-n}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma'_{0i_1}) \geq \frac{5}{8K}\varphi(6),$$

and so by (3.23) and Theorem I,

$$\frac{5}{8K}\varphi(6) \leq \mathrm{Mod}(\Gamma'_{0i_1}) \leq \Big(\frac{2(1+H)H^3\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})-2}}{\delta_{D'}(a', x')}\Big)^n m(B'_{1i}).$$

Then

$$m(B'_{1i}) \geq \frac{5\varphi(6)}{8K\Big(2(1+H)H^3\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})-2}\Big)^n}(\delta_{D'}(a',x'))^n. \tag{3.24}$$

Since (3.14) implies

$$\delta_D(a,y) \geq \delta_D(x_t,y) - \delta_D(a,x_t) \geq \frac{24}{5}\delta_D(x_{t-1},x_t),$$

we see that for each $i \in \{2,\dots,t\}$,

$$\delta_D(a,x_i) \leq \delta_D(a,x_{i-1}) + \delta_D(x_{i-1},x_i) \leq \frac{6}{5}\delta_D(x_{i-1},x_i) \leq \frac{1}{4}\delta_D(a,y).$$

It follows from Theorem O that for each $w' \in \partial B'_{1i}$,

$$\delta_{D'}(x'_1,w') \;\leq\; \delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_i) + \delta_{D'}(x'_i,w') \leq (\mu_{11}+H)\delta_{D'}(a',y').$$

Hence

$$B'_{1i} \subset \mathbb{B}(x'_1, 2\mu_{11}H\delta_{D'}(a',y')).$$

Then by (3.16) and (3.24),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{5\varphi(6)}{8K(2(1+H)H^3\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})-2})^n}(\delta_{D'}(a',x'))^n\cdot t &\leq \sum_{i+1}^{t} m(B'_{1i})\\ &\leq m(\mathbb{B}(a',2\mu_{11}H\delta_{D'}(a',y')))\\ &\leq \omega_{n-1}(2\mu_{11}H\delta_{D'}(a',y'))^n,\end{aligned}$$

and so by (3.13), we get

$$\frac{\delta_{D'}(a',x')}{\delta_{D'}(a',y')} \leq 4(1+H)\mu_{11}H^3\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})-2}\Big(\frac{16K\omega_{n-1}}{5\varphi(6)\log_6\frac{\delta_D(a,y)}{\delta_D(a,x)}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

In this case, we let

$$\psi_2(t) = 4(1+H)\mu_{11}H^3\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})-2}\Big(\frac{16K\omega_{n-1}}{5\varphi(6)\log_6\frac{1}{t}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n}} \tag{3.25}$$

for t in $(0,\frac{1}{4\mu_{11}^2})$. By letting

$$\mu_{12} = \max\Big\{4H\mu_{11}^2, 4(1+H)\mu_{11}H^3\mu_8^{\kappa(\frac{6\mu_{10}^2}{5})-2}\Big(\frac{16K\omega_{n-1}}{5\varphi(6)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n}}\Big\},$$

we see from (3.11) and (3.25) that the homeomorphism

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases}\dfrac{\mu_{12}}{(\log_6\frac{1}{t})^{\frac{1}{n}}}, & \text{if } t \in (0,\dfrac{1}{4\mu_{11}^2})\\ \dfrac{4\mu_{11}^2\mu_{12}}{(\log_6 4\mu_{11}^2)^{\frac{1}{n}}}t, & \text{if } t \in [\dfrac{1}{4\mu_{11}^2},1]\end{cases}$$

is the desired. $\square$

3.1. **The proof of Theorem 1.** The sufficiency of Theorem 1 easily follows from Theorem P. For the proof of the necessity, by definition, it suffices to prove that there exists a homeomorphism $\eta : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ such that the inequality

$$\frac{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2')}{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')} \le \eta\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x_1, x_2)}{\delta_D(x_1, x_3)}\Big)$$

holds for all x_1, x_2 and $x_3 \in A$ with $x_1 \ne x_3$.

We divide the construction into the case when $\delta_D(x_1, x_2) \le \delta_D(x_1, x_3)$ and the case when $\delta_D(x_1, x_2) > \delta_D(x_1, x_3)$. In each case, we will get a homeomorphism or homeomorphisms. Then we construct the desired homeomorphism η from the obtained ones.

First, we suppose that $\delta_D(x_1, x_2) \le \delta_D(x_1, x_3)$. Then Lemma 2 shows that

$$\frac{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2')}{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')} \le \psi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x_1, x_2)}{\delta_D(x_1, x_3)}\Big),$$

where ψ is the homeomorphism defined in Lemma 2. In this case, we let

$$\eta_1(t) = \psi(t) \tag{3.26}$$

for t in $(0, 1]$.

Next, we consider the case $\delta_D(x_1, x_2) > \delta_D(x_1, x_3)$. Again, we divide the discussions into two cases which are as follows.

Case 1. $\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2') \le H_1 \delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')$, *where* $H_1 = 36H^2$ *and* H *is the same constant as in Theorem O.*

Apparently,

$$\frac{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2')}{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')} \le H_1 \frac{\delta_D(x_1, x_2)}{\delta_D(x_1, x_3)}.$$

In this case, we define

$$\eta_2(t) = H_1 \psi(1) t \tag{3.27}$$

for $t > 1$.

Case 2. $\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2') > H_1 \delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')$.

Let α_1' be a curve joining x_1' and x_2' in A', and let x_4' be the first point in α_1' along the direction from x_2' to x_1' such that

$$\delta_{D'}(x_4', x_2') = \frac{1}{8} \delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2'). \tag{3.28}$$

Then we obtain

$$\delta_{D'}(x_4', x_1') \ge \delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2') - \delta_{D'}(x_4', x_2') = \frac{7}{8} \delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2') \tag{3.29}$$

and

$$\delta_{D'}(x_4', x_1') \le \delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2') + \delta_{D'}(x_4', x_2') = \frac{9}{8} \delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2'). \tag{3.30}$$

Claim 3.2. $\min\{\delta_D(x_4, x_1), \delta_D(x_4, x_2)\} \ge H_2 \delta_D(x_1, x_2)$ *with* $H_2 = \frac{\psi^{-1}(\frac{1}{9})}{1+\psi^{-1}(\frac{1}{9})}$.

Now, we prove this claim. If $\delta_D(x_4,x_2)\geq \delta_D(x_4,x_1)$, then by Lemma 2, (3.28) and (3.29), we have

$$7\leq \frac{\delta_{D'}(x'_4,x'_1)}{\delta_{D'}(x'_4,x'_2)}\leq \psi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x_4,x_1)}{\delta_D(x_4,x_2)}\Big).$$

Since $\delta_D(x_4,x_2)+\delta_D(x_4,x_1)\geq \delta_D(x_1,x_2)$, we see that

$$\delta_D(x_4,x_1)\geq \frac{\psi^{-1}(7)}{1+\psi^{-1}(7)}\delta_D(x_1,x_2)\ \text{ and }\ \delta_D(x_4,x_2)\geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_D(x_1,x_2).$$

If $\delta_D(x_4,x_2)<\delta_D(x_4,x_1)$, then by Lemma 2, (3.28) and (3.30), we have

$$\frac{1}{9}\leq \frac{\delta_{D'}(x'_4,x'_2)}{\delta_{D'}(x'_4,x'_1)}\leq \psi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x_4,x_2)}{\delta_D(x_4,x_1)}\Big),$$

whence

$$\delta_D(x_4,x_2)\geq \frac{\psi^{-1}(\frac{1}{9})}{1+\psi^{-1}(\frac{1}{9})}\delta_D(x_1,x_2)\ \text{ and }\ \delta_D(x_4,x_1)\geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_D(x_1,x_2).$$

The proof of Claim 3.2 is complete.

Let $E'_1=\alpha'_1[x'_2,x'_4]$, and let α'_2 be a curve joining x'_1 and x'_3 in A'.

Claim 3.3. *There exists a point y'_3 in α'_2 which satisfies*
(1) $\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_3)\leq \delta_{D'}(x'_1,y'_3)\leq 2H\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_3)$;
(2) $\delta_D(x_1,x_3)\leq \delta_D(x_1,y_3)$; *and*
(3) $\alpha'_1[x'_1,y'_3]\subset \overline{\mathbb{B}}(x'_1,2H\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_3))$.

If $\delta_{D'}(\alpha'_2)\leq 2H\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_3)$, then we let $y'_3=x'_3$. Obviously, y'_3 satisfies the conclusions (1), (2) and (3) in Claim 3.3.

On the other hand, if $\delta_{D'}(\alpha'_2)>2H\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_3)$, then we take y'_3 to be the first point in α'_2 along the direction from x'_1 to x'_3 such that

$$\delta_{D'}(x'_1,y'_3)=\frac{3}{2}H\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_3).$$

Then Theorem O shows that $\delta_D(x_1,x_3)<\delta_D(x_1,y_3)$. Hence Claim 3.3 is true.

Let $E'_2=\alpha'_2[x'_1,y'_3]$. We obtain from Claim 3.2 and the assumption "$\delta_D(x_1,x_2)>\delta_D(x_1,x_3)$" that

$$\begin{aligned}\min\{\mathrm{diam}(E_1),\mathrm{diam}(E_2)\} &\geq \min\{H_2\delta_D(x_1,x_2),\delta_D(x_1,x_3)\}\\ &\geq H_2\delta_D(x_1,x_3).\end{aligned}\tag{3.31}$$

Then it follows from the choice of x'_4, Claim 3.3 and the assumption "$\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_2)>H_1\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_3)$" that for each $u'\in E'_1$ and $v'\in E'_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{D'}(u',v') &\geq \delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_2)-\delta_{D'}(x'_2,u')-\delta_{D'}(x'_1,v')\\ &\geq \Big(\frac{7}{8}-\frac{2H}{H_1}\Big)\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_2).\end{aligned}\tag{3.32}$$

Let

$$\Gamma'_1=\{\gamma':\gamma'\subset \mathbb{B}(x'_1,(\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_2)\delta_{D'}(x'_1,y'_3))^{\frac{1}{2}})\}$$

and

$$\Gamma'_2=\{\gamma':\gamma'\cap \mathbb{S}(x'_1,(\delta_{D'}(x'_1,x'_2)\delta_{D'}(x'_1,y'_3))^{\frac{1}{2}})\neq\emptyset\},$$

where γ' denote the curves joining E_1' and E_2' in D'. Then we infer from (3.3) in Claim 3.3, (3.32), Theorems I and J that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Mod}(E_1', E_2'; D') &\leq \operatorname{Mod}(\Gamma_1') + \operatorname{Mod}(\Gamma_2')\\ &\leq \frac{\omega_{n-1}(\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2')\delta_{D'}(x_1', y_3'))^{\frac{n}{2}}}{((\frac{7}{8} - \frac{2H}{H_1})\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2'))^n}\\ &\quad +\omega_{n-1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2')}{\delta_{D'}(x_1', y_3')}\Big)^{1-n}\\ &\leq 2^n\omega_{n-1}\Big(\log\frac{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2')}{4H^2\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')}\Big)^{1-n},\end{aligned}\tag{3.33}$$

since for each $\gamma' \in \Gamma_2'$, $\gamma' \cap \mathbb{S}(x_1', 2H\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, (3.31) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Mod}(E_1', E_2'; D') &\geq \frac{1}{K}\operatorname{Mod}(E_1, E_2; D) \geq \frac{1}{K}\varphi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(E_1, E_2)}{\min\{\operatorname{diam}(E_1), \operatorname{diam}(E_2)\}}\Big)\\ &\geq \frac{1}{K}\varphi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x_1, x_2)}{H_2\delta_D(x_1, x_3)}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.33), shows that

$$\frac{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_2')}{\delta_{D'}(x_1', x_3')} \leq 4H^2\exp\left(2\Big(\frac{2K\omega_{n-1}}{\varpi}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\right),$$

where $\varpi = \varphi\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x_1,x_2)}{H_2\delta_D(x_1,x_3)}\Big)$. Now, we let

$$\eta_3(t) = 4H^2\exp\left(2H\Big(\frac{K\omega_{n-1}}{\varphi(\frac{1}{H_2}t)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\right)\tag{3.34}$$

for $t > 1$.

Now, we are ready to conclude the existence of the homeomorphism η. By letting $\mu_{13} = \exp\left(2\big(\frac{2K\omega_{n-1}}{\varphi(\frac{1}{H_2})}\big)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\right)$, we see from (3.26), (3.27) and (3.34) that the homeomorphism

$$\eta(t) = \begin{cases} H_1\mu_{13}\eta_1(t) & \text{if } t \in (0, 1],\\ \max\{\mu_{13}\eta_2(t), 9\psi(1)\eta_3(t)\} & \text{if } t \in (1, \infty),\end{cases}$$

is the desired one. The proof of Theorem 1 is complete. □

4. THE EQUIVALENCE OF JOHN DOMAINS

In this section, we will prove Theorem 2. Throughout this section, we always assume that D and D' are bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We begin to prove several lemmas.

Lemma 3. *Let $f : D \to D'$ be a K-quasiconformal mapping and $f : \overline{D} \to \overline{D'}$ be a homeomorphism. Suppose D is a c-uniform domain. Then for $x \in D$ and each $I(x) \in \Phi(x)$, we have*

$$\max\{d_{D'}(x'),\ \operatorname{dist}(x', I'(x))\} \leq \mu_{14}\operatorname{diam}(I'(x)),$$

where

$$\mu_{14}=2\psi_n^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{K\mu_4}\phi_n\Big(4c\Big(1-\exp\big(-(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2})^{\mu_2}\big)^{-1}\Big)\Big)\right)$$

(*we recall here that* $I'(x)=f(I(x))$).

Proof. Let $B_1'=\mathbb{B}(x',\frac{1}{2}d_{D'}(x'))$. For each $z_3'\in\partial B_1'$, by the inequality (2.1), we have

$$k_{D'}(x',z_3')\geq\log\Big(1+\frac{|x'-z_3'|}{d_{D'}(x')}\Big)\geq\log\frac{3}{2},$$

which, together with Theorem E, implies that

$$\max\{k_D(x,z_3),(k_D(x,z_3))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\}\geq\frac{1}{\mu_2}k_{D'}(x',z_3')\geq\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2}.$$

If $|x-z_3|<\frac{1}{2}d_D(x)$, then $k_D(x,z_3)\leq 1$, and so the inequality (2.3) yields

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2}\Big)^{\mu_2}\leq k_D(x,z_3)\leq\log\Big(1+\frac{|z_3-x|}{d_D(x)-|z_3-x|}\Big).$$

Hence we have proved that for $z_3\in\partial B_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|x-z_3| &\geq \min\Big\{1-\exp\big(-(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2})^{\mu_2}\big),\frac{1}{2}\Big\}d_D(x)\\ &= \Big(1-\exp\big(-(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2})^{\mu_2}\big)\Big)d_D(x),\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}\min\{\mathrm{diam}(B_1),\mathrm{diam}(I(x))\} &\geq \min\Big\{2-2\exp\big(-(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2})^{\mu_2}\big),1\Big\}d_D(x)\\ &= 2\Big(1-\exp\big(-(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2})^{\mu_2}\big)\Big)d_D(x).\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from the obvious fact "$\mathrm{dist}(B_1,I(x))\leq 8cd_D(x)$", Theorems G and H that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n\left(4c\Big(1-\exp\big(-(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2})^{\mu_2}\big)\Big)^{-1}\right) &\leq \phi_n\Big(\frac{\mathrm{dist}(B_1,I(x))}{\min\{\mathrm{diam}(B_1),\mathrm{diam}(I(x))\}}\Big)\\ &\leq \mathrm{Mod}\,(B_1,I(x);\mathbb{R}^n)\\ &\leq \mu_4\mathrm{Mod}\,(B_1,I(x);D)\\ &\leq K\mu_4\mathrm{Mod}\,(B_1',I'(x);D')\\ &\leq K\mu_4\mathrm{Mod}\,(B_1',I'(x);\mathbb{R}^n)\\ &\leq K\mu_4\psi_n\Big(\frac{\mathrm{dist}(B_1',I'(x))}{\min\{\mathrm{diam}(B_1'),\mathrm{diam}(I'(x))\}}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{d_{D'}(x'), \mathrm{dist}(x', I'(x))\} &= \mathrm{dist}(x', I'(x)) \le 2\mathrm{dist}(B_1', I'(x))\\ &\le 2\psi_n^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{K\mu_4}\phi_n\left(4c\Big(1-\exp\big(-(\frac{1}{\mu_2}\log\frac{3}{2})^{\mu_2}\big)\Big)\right)\right)\\ &\quad \times \mathrm{diam}(I'(x)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence the proof of the lemma is complete. □

Lemma 4. *Let $f : D \to D'$ be a K-quasiconformal mapping and $f : \overline{D} \to \overline{D'}$ be a homeomorphism. Suppose that D is a c-uniform domain and that there are constants $b \ge 1$ and $\alpha \le 1$ such that $\frac{\mathrm{diam}(P')}{\mathrm{diam}(Q')} \le b\Big(\frac{\mathrm{diam}(P)}{\mathrm{diam}(Q)}\Big)^{\alpha}$ for all continua $P \subset Q \subset \partial D$. Then for $x \in D$ and each $I(x) \in \Phi(x)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{diam}(I'(x)) \le \mu_{15} d_{D'}(x'),$$

where

$$\mu_{15} = \max\left\{72(\exp\mu_2 - 1), 24(\exp\mu_2-1)\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(8c(4b)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})}{K\mu_4}\Big)\right\}.$$

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that there exist some $x \in D$ and $I(x) \in \Phi(x)$ such that

$$\mathrm{diam}(I'(x)) > \mu_{15} d_{D'}(x'). \tag{4.1}$$

Then there must exist a continuum $P \subset I(x)$ such that

$$\mathrm{diam}(P') > \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{diam}(I'(x)) \;\text{ and }\; \mathrm{dist}(x', P') \ge \frac{1}{6}\mathrm{diam}(I'(x)). \tag{4.2}$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{4} < \frac{\mathrm{diam}(P')}{\mathrm{diam}(I'(x))} \le b\Big(\frac{\mathrm{diam}(P)}{\mathrm{diam}(I(x))}\Big)^{\alpha},$$

which implies that

$$\mathrm{diam}(P) > \Big(\frac{1}{4b}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\mathrm{diam}(I(x)). \tag{4.3}$$

Let $B_2 = \mathbb{B}(x, \frac{1}{2}d_D(x))$. Then for $y_3 \in \partial B_2$, we obtain $k_D(x, y_3) \le 1$, and so Theorem E and the inequality (2.1) imply that

$$\log\Big(1 + \frac{|x'-y_3'|}{d_{D'}(x')}\Big) \le k_{D'}(x', y_3') \le \mu_2(k_D(x, y_3))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}} \le \mu_2,$$

whence

$$\mathrm{diam}(B_2') \le 2(\exp(\mu_2) - 1)d_{D'}(x'). \tag{4.4}$$

By (4.1), (4.2) and (4.4), we have

$$\mathrm{dist}(B_2', P') \ge \mathrm{dist}(x', P') - \mathrm{diam}(B_2') \ge \Big(\frac{\mu_{15}}{6} - 2(\exp(\mu_2)-1)\Big)d_{D'}(x'). \tag{4.5}$$

It follows from Theorems G and H, (4.3), (4.4) and (4.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n\Big(8c(4b)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\Big) &\leq \phi_n\Big(\frac{8cd_D(x)}{\min\{\operatorname{diam}(B_2),\operatorname{diam}(P)\}}\Big)\leq\phi_n\Big(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(B_2,P)}{\min\{\operatorname{diam}(B_2),\operatorname{diam}(P)\}}\Big)\\ &\leq \operatorname{Mod}(B_2,P;\mathbb{R}^n)\leq\mu_4\operatorname{Mod}(B_2,P;D)\leq K\mu_4\operatorname{Mod}(B_2',P';D')\\ &\leq K\mu_4\psi_n\Big(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(B_2',P')}{\min\{\operatorname{diam}(B_2'),\operatorname{diam}(P')\}}\Big)\\ &\leq K\mu_4\psi_n\Big(\frac{\frac{1}{6}\mu_{15}-2(\exp\mu_2-1)}{2(\exp\mu_2-1)}\Big)\leq K\mu_4\psi_n\Big(\frac{5\mu_{15}}{72(\exp\mu_2-1)}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

since $\operatorname{dist}(B_2,P)\leq\operatorname{dist}(x,P)\leq 8cd_D(x)$. This is the desired contradiction. □

Lemma 5. *Suppose that D and D' are bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that $f:\ D\to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping, that D is c-uniform, that $f:\overline{D}\to\overline{D'}$ is a homeomorphism, and suppose further that $f:(D,\delta_D)\to(D',\delta_{D'})$ is η-quasisymmetric. Then for $x\in D$ and each $I(x)\in\Phi(x)$, we have*

$$\operatorname{diam}\big(I'(x)\big)\leq\mu_{16}d_{D'}(x'),$$

where $\mu_{16}=3\eta(16c^2)(\exp\mu_2-1)$.

Proof. For $x\in D$, let $y_1'\in D'$ be such that

$$y_1\in\mathbb{B}(x,8cd_D(x))\ \text{ and }\ |x'-y_1'|\geq\frac{1}{3}\operatorname{diam}(I'(x)),\tag{4.6}$$

and let $y_2\in D$ be such that $|y_2-x|=\frac{1}{2}d_D(x)$. Obviously, $k_D(x,y_2)\leq 1$, and so Theorem E and (2.2) imply that

$$\log\Big(1+\frac{\ell(\gamma')}{d_{D'}(x')}\Big)\leq k_{D'}(x',y_2')\leq\mu_2\max\{k_D(x,y_2),(k_D(x,y_2))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\}\mu_2\leq\mu_2,$$

where γ' is a quasihyperbolic geodesic joining x' and y_2' in D', and then

$$\ell(\gamma')\leq(\exp\mu_2-1)d_{D'}(x').\tag{4.7}$$

Let γ_2 be a double c-cone arc joining y_1 and x in D. The existence of γ_2 follows from the assumption that "D being c-uniform". Then

$$\delta_D(x,y_1)\leq\ell(\gamma_2)\leq c|y_1-x|,\tag{4.8}$$

and thus the hypotheses, (4.6) and (4.8) show that

$$\frac{\operatorname{diam}(I'(x))}{\delta_{D'}(x',y_2')}\leq\frac{3\delta_{D'}(x',y_1')}{\delta_{D'}(x',y_2')}\leq 3\eta\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x,y_1)}{\delta_D(x,y_2)}\Big)\leq 3\eta(16c^2),$$

which, together with (4.7), yields that

$$\operatorname{diam}(I'(x))\leq 3\eta(16c^2)\delta_{D'}(x',y_2')\leq 3\eta(16c^2)\ell(\gamma')\leq 3\eta(16c^2)(\exp\mu_2-1)d_{D'}(x'),$$

from which the proof follows by taking $\mu_{16}=3\eta(16c^2)(\exp\mu_2-1)$. □

Lemma 6. *Let $f : D \to D'$ be a K-quasiconformal mapping and $f : \overline{D} \to \overline{D'}$ be a homeomorphism. Suppose that D is a c-uniform domain and that there are constants $\epsilon_0 \geq 1$ and $\alpha \leq 1$ such that for all $x, w \in D$ with $|x-w| \leq 8cd_D(x)$ and $d_D(w) \leq 2cd_D(x)$, the inequality*

$$a_f(w) \leq \epsilon_0 a_f(x)\Big(\frac{d(x)}{d(w)}\Big)^{1-\alpha}$$

holds. Then for $x \in D$ and $I(x) \in \Phi(x)$, we have

$$\mathrm{diam}(I'(x)) \leq \mu_{18} d_{D'}(x'),$$

where $\mu_{17} = (5c\epsilon_0\mu_7^2)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ and

$$\mu_{18} = 3(1+8c^2\mu_{17})^{\mu_1\mu_2}\bigg(1+(\exp(\mu_2)-1)\bigg(\frac{10c}{5c-1}+\frac{1}{5c-1}\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)\bigg)\bigg).$$

Proof. For $x_1 \in D$, we take $z_1 \in \mathbb{B}(x_1, 8cd_D(x_1)) \cap D$ such that

$$d_D(z_1) \leq \Big(\frac{1}{5c\epsilon_0\mu_7^2}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} d_D(x_1) \ \text{ and } \ |z_1' - x_1'| \geq \frac{1}{3}\mathrm{diam}(I'(x_1)). \tag{4.9}$$

Obviously,

$$|z_1 - x_1| > \frac{1}{2} d_D(x_1). \tag{4.10}$$

Let γ denote a double c-cone arc joining z_1 and x_1 in D. Then

$$\ell(\gamma) \leq c|z_1 - x_1| \leq 8c^2 d_D(x_1). \tag{4.11}$$

Let z_0 be the midpoint of γ with respect to the arc length and $\mu_{17} = (5c\epsilon_0\mu_7^2)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, where μ_7 is the same constant as in Theorem R. Since by (4.10),

$$d_D(z_0) \geq \frac{1}{2c}|z_1 - x_1| > \frac{1}{4c} d_D(x_1),$$

it follows from (4.9) that there must exist a nonnegative integer m such that

$$\mu_{17}^m\, d_D(z_1) \leq d_D(z_0) < \mu_{17}^{m+1}\, d_D(z_1). \tag{4.12}$$

We use x_0 to denote the first point in γ from z_1 to z_0 satisfying

$$d_D(x_0) = \mu_{17}^m\, d_D(z_1).$$

Let $y_1 = z_1$. If $x_0 = y_1$, we let $y_2 = z_0$. If $x_0 \neq y_1$, then we choose points $y_2, \ldots, y_{m+1}$ in $\gamma[z_1, z_0]$ such that for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, m+1\}$, y_i is the first point from z_1 to z_0 with

$$d_D(y_i) = \mu_{17}^{i-1}\, d_D(y_1). \tag{4.13}$$

Obviously, $y_{m+1} = x_0$. If $x_0 \neq z_0$, then we let $y_{m+2} = z_0$. It easily follows from (4.12) that

$$d_D(y_{m+1}) > \frac{1}{\mu_{17}} d_D(z_0) \geq \frac{1}{2c\mu_{17}}\ell(\gamma).$$

Hence Theorem D and (4.11) show that

$$k_D(y_{m+1}, x_1) \leq \mu_1 \log\Big(1 + \frac{|y_{m+1} - x_1|}{\min\{d_D(y_{m+1}), d_D(x_1)\}}\Big) \leq \mu_1 \log(1 + 8c^2\mu_{17}),$$

and then by Theorem E, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\log \frac{d_{D'}(y'_{m+1})}{d_{D'}(x'_1)} &\leq k_{D'}(y'_{m+1}, x'_1) \leq \mu_2 \max\{k_D(y_{m+1}, x_1), (k_D(y_{m+1}, x_1))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\}\\ &\leq \mu_1\mu_2 \log(1 + 8c^2\mu_{17}),\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$d_{D'}(y'_{m+1}) \leq (1 + 8c^2\mu_{17})^{\mu_1\mu_2} d_{D'}(x'_1). \tag{4.14}$$

Similarly, by (2.1), it follows that

$$|y'_{m+1} - x'_1| \leq \big((1 + 8c^2\mu_{17})^{\mu_1\mu_2} - 1\big) d_{D'}(x'_1). \tag{4.15}$$

Moreover, we infer from the assumptions that for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, m+1\}$,

$$a_f(y_{i-1}) \leq \epsilon_0 a_f(y_i)\Big(\frac{d_D(y_i)}{d_D(y_{i-1})}\Big)^{1-\alpha},$$

which, together with Theorem R, shows that

$$d_{D'}(y'_{i-1}) \leq \frac{1}{5c} d_{D'}(y'_i). \tag{4.16}$$

Now we prove a claim.

Claim 4.1. *For each $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$, we have*

$$|y'_i - y'_{i-1}| \leq 2(\exp \mu_2 - 1)\Bigg(2 + \frac{1}{5c}\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)\Bigg) d_{D'}(y'_i).$$

To prove this claim, we let $B_i = \mathbb{B}(y_i, \frac{1}{2}d_D(y_i))$ for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$. Then for $w \in \partial B_i$, $k_D(y_i, w) \leq 1$, and so Theorem E and (2.1) imply that

$$\log\Big(1 + \frac{|y'_i - w'|}{d_{D'}(y'_i)}\Big) \leq k_{D'}(y'_i, w') \leq \mu_2 (k_D(y_i, w))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}} \leq \mu_2,$$

whence

$$\operatorname{diam}(B'_i) \leq 2(\exp \mu_2 - 1) d_{D'}(y'_i). \tag{4.17}$$

It easily follows from (4.13) and the inequality

$$|y_i - y_{i-1}| \geq d_D(y_i) - d_D(y_{i-1}) = \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\mu_{17}}\Big) d_D(y_i)$$

that for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$,

$$B_i \cap B_{i-1} = \emptyset.$$

Then we have from Theorems G and H, (4.13) that for each $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n(c\mu_{17}) &\leq \phi_n\Big(\frac{cd_D(y_i)}{\min\{\mathrm{diam}(B_{i-1}),\mathrm{diam}(B_i)\}}\Big)\leq \phi_n\Big(\frac{\mathrm{dist}(B_{i-1},B_i)}{\min\{\mathrm{diam}(B_{i-1}),\mathrm{diam}(B_i)\}}\Big)\\ &\leq \mathrm{Mod}\,(B_{i-1},B_i;\mathbb{R}^n)\leq \mu_4\mathrm{Mod}\,(B_{i-1},B_i;D)\leq K\mu_4\mathrm{Mod}\,(B'_{i-1},B'_i;D')\\ &\leq K\mu_4\psi_n\Big(\frac{\mathrm{dist}(B'_{i-1},B'_i)}{\min\{\mathrm{diam}(B'_{i-1}),\mathrm{diam}(B'_i)\}}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (4.16) and (4.17), shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{dist}(B'_{i-1},B'_i) &\leq \psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)\min\{\mathrm{diam}(B'_{i-1}),\mathrm{diam}(B'_i)\}\\ &\leq \frac{2(\exp\mu_2-1)}{5c}\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)d_{D'}(y'_i),\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}|y'_i-y'_{i-1}| &\leq \mathrm{dist}(B'_{i-1},B'_i)+2\max\{\mathrm{diam}(B'_{i-1}),\mathrm{diam}(B'_i)\}\\ &\leq \frac{2(\exp\mu_2-1)}{5c}\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)d_{D'}(y'_i)+4(\exp\mu_2-1)d_{D'}(y'_i)\\ &\leq 2(\exp\mu_2-1)\bigg(2+\frac{1}{5c}\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)\bigg)d_{D'}(y'_i).\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Claim 4.1 is complete.

We are ready to conclude the proof. It follows from Claim 4.1, (4.9), (4.14), (4.15) and (4.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diam}(I'(x)) &\leq 3|y'_1-x'_1|\leq 3(|y'_1-y'_2|+\cdots+|y'_{m+1}-x'_1|)\\ &\leq \frac{15c(\exp\mu_2-1)}{5c-1}\bigg(2+\frac{1}{5c}\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)\bigg)d_{D'}(y'_{m+1})\\ &\quad +3(1+8c^2\mu_{17})^{\mu_1\mu_2}d_{D'}(x'_1)\\ &\leq 3(1+8c^2\mu_{17})^{\mu_1\mu_2}\bigg(1+(\exp\mu_2-1)\bigg(\frac{10c}{5c-1}\\ &\quad +\frac{1}{5c-1}\psi_n^{-1}\Big(\frac{\phi_n(c\mu_{17})}{K\mu_4}\Big)\bigg)\bigg)d_{D'}(x'_1).\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the lemma is complete. □

4.1. **The proof of Theorem 2.** Obviously, it suffices to prove two groups of implications:
(I) (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (6) $\Longrightarrow$ (7) $\Longrightarrow$ (4) $\Longrightarrow$ (5) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3); and
(II) (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (8) $\Longrightarrow$ (9) $\Longrightarrow$ (10) $\Longrightarrow$ (3).

4.2. (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (6) $\Longrightarrow$ (7) $\Longrightarrow$ (4) $\Longrightarrow$ (5) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3)**.**

The implications (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) easily follow from Theorems K, L, M, , N and Remark 2. Lemma 4 shows that the implication (7) $\Longrightarrow$ (4) is true. So it remains to prove four implications as follows.

4.2.1. (4) $\Longrightarrow$ (5).

For w and x in D with $|w-x|\leq 8cd_D(x)$, let γ_1 be a double c-cone arc joining w and x in D, and let z_0 be the midpoint of γ_1 with respect to the arc length. Obviously,

$$\ell(\gamma_1)\leq c|w-x|\leq 8c^2d_D(x)\ \text{ and }\ \ell(\gamma_1)\leq 2cd_D(z_0). \tag{4.18}$$

Then it follows from Theorem D that

$$k_D(z_0,x)\leq \mu_1\log\Big(1+\frac{|x-z_0|}{\min\{d_D(z_0),d_D(x)\}}\Big)\leq \mu_1\log(1+4c^2).$$

Then by Theorem E and (2.1), we get

$$\log\frac{d_{D'}(z_0')}{d_{D'}(x')}\leq k_{D'}(z_0',x')\leq \mu_2\max\{k_D(z_0,x),(k_D(z_0,x))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\}\leq \mu_1\mu_2\log(1+4c^2),$$

and so

$$d_{D'}(z_0')\leq (1+4c^2)^{\mu_1\mu_2}d_{D'}(x'). \tag{4.19}$$

We choose $y_0'\in\gamma_1'$ such that

$$|y_0'-z_0'|\geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_{D'}(w',x'). \tag{4.20}$$

On one hand, if $d_D(y_0)\geq \frac{1}{2}d_D(z_0)$, then by Theorem D and (4.18), we have

$$k_D(z_0,y_0)\leq \mu_1\log\Big(1+\frac{|z_0-y_0|}{\min\{d_D(z_0),d_D(y_0)\}}\Big)\leq \mu_1\log(1+2c),$$

which, together with (2.1) and Theorem E, yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\log\frac{|y_0'-z_0'|}{d_{D'}(z_0')}\leq k_{D'}(y_0',z_0') &\leq \mu_2\max\{k_D(z_0,y_0),(k_D(z_0,y_0))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\}\\ &\leq \mu_1\mu_2\log(1+2c).\end{aligned}$$

Then we infer from (4.19) and (4.20) that

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{D'}(w',x')\leq 2|y_0'-z_0'| &\leq 2(1+2c)^{\mu_1\mu_2}d_{D'}(z_0')\\ &\leq 2(8c^3+4c^2+2c+1)^{\mu_1\mu_2}d_{D'}(x').\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

On the other hand, if $d_D(y_0)<\frac{1}{2}d_D(z_0)$, then it follows from $\mathbb{B}(y_0,6cd_D(z_0))\subset\mathbb{B}(z_0,8cd_D(z_0))$ that there exists some continuum P_1 such that

(1) $P_1\subset\partial D\cap\mathbb{B}(y_0,6cd_D(z_0))$;
(2) $P_1\cap\mathbb{S}(y_0,d_D(y_0)))\neq\emptyset$;
(3) $\operatorname{diam}(P_1)\geq 2d_D(z_0)$;
(4) there exist $I(z_0)\in\Phi(z_0)$ and $I(y_0)\in\Phi(y_0)$ such that $I(y_0)\subset I(z_0)\subset P_1$.

The combination of (4.19), Lemma 3 and the condition (4) in the theorem leads to

$$\begin{aligned}|y_0'-z_0'| &\leq \operatorname{dist}(y_0',I'(y_0))+\operatorname{dist}(z_0',I'(z_0))+\operatorname{diam}(I'(z_0))\\ &\leq (2a_1+1)\operatorname{diam}(I'(z_0))\leq (2a_1+1)b_1d_{D'}(z_0')\\ &\leq (2a_1+1)b_1(1+4c^2)^{\mu_1\mu_2}d_{D'}(x'),\end{aligned}$$

and thus (4.20) implies that

$$\delta_{D'}(w', x') \le 2(2a_1+1)b_1(1+4c^2)^{\mu_1\mu_2} d_{D'}(x'). \tag{4.22}$$

The proof of the condition (5) in the theorem easily follows from (4.21) and (4.22) by taking $b_2 = 2(1+4c^2)^{\mu_1\mu_2} \max\{(1+2c^2)^{\mu_1\mu_2}, (2a_1+1)b_1\}$.

4.2.2. (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (6).

For $x, w \in D$, we assume that $|x-w| \le 8cd_D(x)$ and $d_D(w) \le 2cd_D(x)$. To prove the truth of the condition (6) in the theorem, we consider two cases.

Case 1. $|x-w| > \frac{1}{2}d_D(x)$.

Let $y_1' \in D'$ be such that $|y_1' - w'| = \frac{1}{2}d_{D'}(w')$. Then $k_{D'}(y_1', w') \le 1$, and so Theorem E and (2.1) imply that

$$\log\Big(1+\frac{\delta_D(y_1,w)}{d_D(w)}\Big) \le k_D(y_1,w) \le \mu_2 \max\Big\{k_D(y_1',w'), k_D(y_1',w')^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\Big\} \le \mu_2,$$

and so

$$\delta_D(y_1,w) \le (\exp(\mu_2)-1)d_D(w). \tag{4.23}$$

It follows from the condition (3) in the theorem and [29] that we may assume that f is η-QS with $\eta(t) = a\max\{t, t^\alpha\}$ for $t > 0$, where the constants $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and a depend only on c, K and n. Then Lemma 5 and the known implication (4) $\Longrightarrow$ (5) imply that the condition (5) in the theorem holds, and so (4.23) and the assumption "$d_D(w) \le 2cd_D(x)$" show that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d_{D'}(w')}{2b_2 d_{D'}(x')} &\le \frac{\delta_{D'}(y_1',w')}{\delta_{D'}(x',w')} \le \eta\Big(\frac{\delta_D(y_1,w)}{\delta_D(x,w)}\Big) \le \eta\Big(\frac{2(\exp(\mu_2)-1)d_D(w)}{d_D(x)}\Big) \\ &\le 2a(\exp(\mu_2)-1)\max\Big\{\frac{d_D(w)}{d_D(x)}, \Big(\frac{d_D(w)}{d_D(x)}\Big)^\alpha\Big\} \\ &\le 4ac(\exp(\mu_2)-1)\Big(\frac{d_D(w)}{d_D(x)}\Big)^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\frac{d_{D'}(w')}{d_D(w)} \le 8ab_2c(\exp(\mu_2)-1)\frac{d_{D'}(x')}{d_D(x)} \cdot \Big(\frac{d_D(x)}{d_D(w)}\Big)^{1-\alpha},$$

and by Theorem R, we have

$$a_f(w) \le 8ab_2c\mu_7^2(\exp(\mu_2)-1)a_f(x)\Big(\frac{d_D(x)}{d_D(w)}\Big)^{1-\alpha}. \tag{4.24}$$

Case 2. $|x-w| \le \frac{1}{2}d_D(x)$.

Obviously,

$$k_D(x,w) \le \int_{[w,x]} \frac{|dz|}{d_D(z)} \le \frac{2|w-x|}{d_D(x)} \le 3\log\frac{3d_D(w)}{d_D(x)},$$

since $d_D(z) \geq d_D(x) - |x-z| \geq \frac{1}{2}d_D(x)$ for each $z \in [w,x]$. It follows from Theorem E and (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}\log \frac{d_{D'}(w')}{d_{D'}(x')} &\leq k_{D'}(x',w') \leq \mu_2 \max\Big\{k_D(x,w), k_D(x,w)^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\Big\}\\ &\leq 3\log\frac{3}{2} \leq 3\mu_2 \log\frac{3d_D(w)}{d_D(x)},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{d_{D'}(w')}{d_{D'}(x')} \leq \Big(\frac{3d_D(w)}{d_D(x)}\Big)^{3\mu_2},$$

whence

$$\frac{d_{D'}(w')}{d_D(w)} \leq 27^{\mu_2}\frac{d_{D'}(x')}{d_D(x)} \cdot \Big(\frac{d_D(x)}{d_D(w)}\Big)^{1-3\mu_2}.$$

We infer from Theorem R that

$$a_f(w) \leq 2^{3\mu_2-\alpha}3^{3\mu_2}\mu_7^2 a_f(x)\Big(\frac{d_D(x)}{d_D(w)}\Big)^{1-\alpha}, \tag{4.25}$$

since $\frac{1}{2}d_D(x) \leq d_D(w) \leq d_D(x) + |x-w| \leq \frac{3}{2}d_D(x)$.

We conclude from (4.24) and (4.25) that the condition (6) in the theorem is true.

4.2.3. (6) $\Longrightarrow$ (7).

Suppose that the condition (6) in the theorem holds true and that P, Q are continua in ∂D with $P \subset Q$. Since D is a c-uniform domain, there exists some $z_0 \in D$ such that

$$\mathrm{diam}(D) \leq 3c d_D(z_0).$$

Let $x_1 \in D$ be such that

$$|x_1 - z_0| \geq \frac{7}{16}\mathrm{diam}(Q) \ \text{ and } \ \mathrm{dist}(x_1, Q) < \frac{1}{64}\mathrm{diam}(Q). \tag{4.26}$$

We choose a double c-cone arc γ_2 in D joining x_1 and z_0, and use x_0 to denote the midpoint of γ_2 with respect to the arc length. Further, we take $x_2 \in \gamma_2[x_1, x_0]$ such that

$$\ell(\gamma_2[x_1,x_2]) = \frac{7}{32}\mathrm{diam}(Q). \tag{4.27}$$

Since

$$d_D(x_2) \leq |x_1 - x_2| + \mathrm{dist}(x_1, Q) \leq \frac{15}{64}\mathrm{diam}(Q),$$

we see from (4.27) that

$$\frac{64}{15}d_D(x_2) \leq \mathrm{diam}(Q) \leq \frac{32c}{7}d_D(x_2). \tag{4.28}$$

For $z \in Q$, we have

$$|z - x_2| \leq \mathrm{diam}(Q) + \mathrm{dist}(x_1,Q) + |x_1 - x_2| \leq \frac{79}{64}\mathrm{diam}(Q),$$

and hence by (4.28), we know that

$$Q \subset \mathbb{B}(x_2, 8c d_D(x_2)) \cap \partial D,$$

which, together with (4.28), shows

$$Q \in \Phi(x_2).$$

Similarly, we see that there exist x_3, $x_4 \in D$ such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(x_3, P) \leq \frac{1}{64}\operatorname{diam}(P) \ \text{ and } \ |x_3 - x_4| \leq \frac{7}{32}\operatorname{diam}(P), \tag{4.29}$$

$$P \in \Phi(x_4), \ \ \frac{64}{15}d_D(x_4) \leq \operatorname{diam}(P) \leq \frac{32c}{7}d_D(x_4), \tag{4.30}$$

and for $w \in P$,

$$|w - x_4| \leq \frac{79}{64}\operatorname{diam}(P).$$

By (4.26), (4.27), (4.28) and (4.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_2 - x_4| &\leq |x_2 - x_1| + |x_3 - x_4| + \operatorname{dist}(x_3, P) + \operatorname{dist}(x_1, Q) \\ &\quad +\operatorname{diam}(Q) \\ &\leq \frac{47}{32}\operatorname{diam}(Q) < \frac{47c}{7}d_D(x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Then we infer from (4.28), (4.30), the condition (6) and Theorem R that

$$\frac{d_{D'}(x'_4)}{d_D(x_4)} \leq \mu_7 a_f(x_4) \leq b_3\mu_7 a_f(x_2)\Big(\frac{d_D(x_2)}{d_D(x_4)}\Big)^{1-\alpha} \leq b_3\mu_7^2\frac{d_{D'}(x'_2)}{d_D(x_2)}\Big(\frac{d_D(x_2)}{d_D(x_4)}\Big)^{1-\alpha},$$

and thus by Lemmas 3 and 6, (4.28) and (4.30), we have

$$\frac{\operatorname{diam}(P')}{a_1\mu_{18}\operatorname{diam}(Q')} \leq \frac{d_{D'}(x'_4)}{d_{D'}(x'_2)} \leq b_3\mu_7^2\Big(\frac{d_D(x_4)}{d_D(x_2)}\Big)^{\alpha} \leq b_3\Big(\frac{15c}{14}\Big)^{\alpha}\mu_7^2\Big(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(P)}{\operatorname{diam}(Q)}\Big)^{\alpha},$$

from which the proof follows.

4.2.4. (5) $\Longrightarrow$ (1).

To prove that D' is a John domain, we let w_1 and $w_2 \in D$ be such that

$$|w_1 - w_2| > \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{diam}(D), \tag{4.31}$$

and let γ_3 be a double c-cone arc joining w_1 and w_2 in D. Further, we use x_0 to denote the midpoint of γ_3 with respect to the arc length. Then by (4.31), we have

$$d_D(x_0) \geq \frac{1}{2c}\ell(\gamma_3) > \frac{1}{4c}\operatorname{diam}(D). \tag{4.32}$$

For $z_1 \in D$, we let $\alpha\mu_8$ be a double c-cone arc joining z_1 and x_0 in D, and y_0 the midpoint of α_0 with respect to the arc length. Then we have the following two claims.

Claim 4.2. *For $y \in \alpha_0[y_0, x_0]$, we have $d_D(y) \geq \frac{1}{2c}d_D(x_0)$.*

For a proof of this claim, we consider two cases. If $|x_0 - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}d_D(x_0)$, then

$$d_D(y) \geq d_D(x_0) - |x_0 - y| \geq \frac{1}{2}d_D(x_0),$$

and if $|x_0 - y| > \frac{1}{2} d_D(x_0)$, then

$$d_D(y) \geq \frac{1}{c}\ell(\alpha_0[x_0, y]) \geq \frac{1}{c}|x_0 - y| > \frac{1}{2c} d_D(x_0),$$

since α_0 is a double c-cone arc. The proof of Claim 4.2 is complete.

Claim 4.3. *α'_0 is a b'_1-carrot (diameter) arc, where*

$$b'_1 = 2(b_2 \exp(4c^3\mu_2) + \exp(4c^3\mu_2) - 1).$$

Now we prove this claim. For $y \in \alpha_0$, if $y \in \alpha_0[z_1, y_0]$, then

$$|z_1 - y| \leq \ell(\alpha_0[z_1, y]) \leq c d_D(y).$$

Obviously, there is some y'_1 in $\alpha'_0[z'_1, y']$ such that

$$|y'_1 - y'| \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{diam}(\alpha'_0[z'_1, y']),$$

and so it follows from the condition (5) in the theorem that

$$\mathrm{diam}(\alpha'_0[z'_1, y']) \leq 2\delta_{D'}(y'_1, y') \leq 2b_2 d_{D'}(y'). \tag{4.33}$$

If $y \in \alpha_0[x_0, y_0]$, then for each $u \in \alpha_0[y_0, y]$, by Claim 4.2 and (4.32), we have

$$k_D(u, y) \leq \int_{\alpha_0[u,y]} \frac{|dz|}{d_D(z)} \leq \frac{2c\ell(\alpha_0[u, y])}{d_D(x_0)} \leq \frac{2c^2 d_D(u)}{d_D(x_0)} \leq 4c^3,$$

which, together with Theorem E and (2.1), shows that

$$\log\Big(1 + \frac{|u' - y'|}{d_{D'}(y')}\Big) \leq k_{D'}(u', y') \leq \mu_2 \max\{k_D(u, y), (k_D(u, y))^{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}\} \leq 4c^3\mu_2,$$

whence

$$|u' - y'| \leq (\exp(4c^3\mu_2) - 1) d_{D'}(y'). \tag{4.34}$$

Also Theorem E and (2.1) imply that

$$\log \frac{d_{D'}(y'_0)}{d_{D'}(y')} \leq k_{D'}(y'_0, y') \leq 4c^3\mu_2,$$

and so

$$d_{D'}(y'_0) \leq \exp(4c^3\mu_2) d_{D'}(y'). \tag{4.35}$$

By (4.33), (4.34) and (4.35), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{diam}(\alpha'_0[z'_1, y']) &\leq \mathrm{diam}(\alpha'_0[z'_1, y'_0]) + \mathrm{diam}(\alpha'_0[y'_0, y']) \\ &\leq 2b_2 d_{D'}(y'_0) + 2(\exp(4c^3\mu_2) - 1) d_{D'}(y') \\ &\leq 2(b_2 \exp(4c^3\mu_2) + \exp(4c^3\mu_2) - 1) d_{D'}(y'). \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

It follows from (4.33) and (4.36) that the proof of Claim 4.3 is complete.

The combination of Theorem K, Theorem M, Theorem N, Claim 4.3 and (4.32) shows that the condition (1) in the theorem is true. □

4.3. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (8) $\Longrightarrow$ (9) $\Longrightarrow$ (10) $\Longrightarrow$ (3).

The implications (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (8) $\Longrightarrow$ (9) $\Longrightarrow$ (10) follow from [12, Theorem 3.1], and the implication (10) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) follows from Theorem 1. □

5. Hölder continuity of quasiconformal mappings

By using Theorem 2, we will give a proof for Theorem 3 in this section.

5.1. **The proof of Theorem 3.** Since D is a c-uniform domain, we see that there exists some $x_0 \in D$ such that

$$\operatorname{diam}(D) \leq 3c d_D(x_0). \tag{5.1}$$

It follows from Theorem 2 that we may assume that f is η-QS, where $\eta(t) = \mu_{19}\max\{t, t^a\}$ for $t > 0$, the constants $a \in (0,1]$ and μ_{19} depend only on c, φ and $\frac{\operatorname{diam}(D')}{d_{D'}(x'_0)}$.

To prove the theorem it suffices to show that for all x, $y \in D$,

$$|x' - y'| \leq \mu_{20}\, |x-y|^\alpha, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\mu_{20} = 18 b_0 \mu_{19} c^2 \frac{\operatorname{diam}(D')}{(\operatorname{diam}(D))^\alpha}$, $\alpha = \min\{a, a_1\}$ and the constants a_1, b_0 are the same as in Theorem C.

Clearly

$$\delta_D(x,y) \leq c|x-y|. \tag{5.3}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$\max\{|x-x_0|, |y-x_0|\} = |x-x_0|.$$

We shall consider the cases where $|x-x_0| \geq \frac{1}{6}d_D(x_0)$ and where $|x-x_0| < \frac{1}{6}d_D(x_0)$, separately.

Suppose first that $|x-x_0| \geq \frac{1}{6}d_D(x_0)$. Then (5.1) implies that

$$\delta_D(x,x_0) \geq |x-x_0| \geq \frac{1}{6}d_D(x_0) \geq \frac{1}{18c}\operatorname{diam}(D),$$

and thus it follows from the assumptions "f being η-QS" and (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|x'-y'|}{\delta_{D'}(x',x'_0)} &\leq \frac{\delta_{D'}(x',y')}{\delta_{D'}(x',x'_0)} \leq \eta\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x,y)}{\delta_D(x,x_0)}\Big) \\
&= \mu_{19}\max\Big\{\frac{\delta_D(x,y)}{\delta_D(x,x_0)}, \Big(\frac{\delta_D(x,y)}{\delta_D(x,x_0)}\Big)^a\Big\} \\
&\leq \mu_{19}\max\Big\{\frac{18c\delta_D(x,y)}{\operatorname{diam}(D)}, \Big(\frac{18c\delta_D(x,y)}{\operatorname{diam}(D)}\Big)^a\Big\} \\
&\leq 18\mu_{19}c\Big(\frac{\delta_D(x,y)}{\operatorname{diam}(D)}\Big)^a \leq 18\mu_{19}c^2\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{\operatorname{diam}(D)}\Big)^a,
\end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{\delta_D(x,y)}{\operatorname{diam}(D)} \leq 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|x'-y'| &\leq 18\mu_{19}c^2\delta_{D'}(x',x'_0)\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{\operatorname{diam}(D)}\Big)^a \\
&\leq 18\mu_{19}c^2\operatorname{diam}(D')\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{\operatorname{diam}(D)}\Big)^a.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Suppose next that $|x-x_0|<\frac{1}{6}d_D(x_0)$. Then

$$|x-y|\leq |x-x_0|+|y-x_0|\leq \frac{1}{3}d_D(x_0)\leq \frac{1}{6}\mathrm{diam}(D)$$

and so

$$d_D(x)\geq d_D(x_0)-|x-x_0|\geq \frac{5}{6}d_D(x_0)\geq \frac{5}{2}|x-y|,$$

which, together with Theorem C and (5.1), shows that

$$\frac{|x'-y'|}{d_{D'}(x')}\leq b_0\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{d_D(x)}\Big)^{a_1}\leq b_0\Big(\frac{18c}{5}\Big)^{a_1}\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{\mathrm{diam}(D)}\Big)^{a_1},$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}|x'-y'| &\leq b_0\Big(\frac{18c}{5}\Big)^{a_1}d_{D'}(x')\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{\mathrm{diam}(D)}\Big)^{a_1}\\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}b_0\Big(\frac{18c}{5}\Big)^{a_1}\mathrm{diam}(D')\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{\mathrm{diam}(D)}\Big)^{a_1}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

Hence it follows from (5.4) and (5.5) that (5.2) is true by taking

$$\mu_{20}=18b_0\mu_{19}c^2\frac{\mathrm{diam}(D')}{(\mathrm{diam}(D))^{\alpha}}\ \text{ and }\ \alpha=\min\{a,a_1\},$$

since $\frac{|x-y|}{\mathrm{diam}(D)}\leq 1$. □

6. A remark on Theorem 2

We end this paper with a remark on Theorem 2. In [18], the following generalization of Theorem N was proved.

Theorem S. ([18, Theorem 1.2]) *Suppose that $f:D\to D'$ is a K-quasiconformal mapping between domains D and $D'\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, where D is ϕ-broad. Suppose also that $A\subset D$ is a arcwise connected set and that $A'=f(A)$ has the c_1-carrot property in D' with center $y_0'\in\overline{D'}$. If $y_0'\neq\infty$, we assume that A is bounded. If $y_0'=\infty$, we assume that f extends to a homeomorphism $D\cup\{\infty\}\to D'\cup\{\infty\}$. Then $f|_A$ is η-quasisymmetric in the metrics δ_D and $\delta_{D'}$ with η depending only on the data $\nu=(c_1,K,\phi,n)$.*

In the proof of Theorem 2, by replacing Theorem N with Theorem S, we see that the constants in Theorem 2 can be taken to be the ones which are independent of the related fixed point x_0 in D.

References

1. L. V. Ahlfors, Quasiconformal reflections, *Acta Math.,* **109** (1963), 291–301.
2. K. Astala and F. W. Gehring, Quasiconformal analogues of theorems of Koebe and Hardy-Littlewood, *Michigan Math. J.,* **32** (1985), 99–107.
3. A. F. Beardon, The Apollonian metric of a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, In: Quasiconformal mappings and analysis, Springer-Verlag, 1998, 91–108.
4. Z. M. Balogh and P. Koskela, Quasiconformality, quasisymmetry and removability in Loewer spaces, *Duke J. Math.,* **101** (2000), 555–577.

5. M. Bonk, J. Heinonen and P. Koskela, Uniformizing Gromov hyperbolic domains, *Asterisque,* **270** (2001), 1–99.
6. O. J. Broch, Geometry of John disks, Ph. D. Thesis, NTNU, 2004.
7. F. W. Gehring, Uniform domains and the ubiquitous quasidisk, *Jahresber. Deutsch. Math. Verein,* **89** (1987), 88–103.
8. F. W. Gehring and O. Martio, Quasiextremal distance domains and extension of quasiconformal mappings, *J. Analyse Math.,* **45** (1985), 181–206.
9. F. W. Gehring and B. G. Osgood, Uniform domains and the quasi-hyperbolic metric, *J. Analyse Math.,* **36** (1979), 50–74.
10. F. W. Gehring and B. P. Palka, Quasiconformally homogeneous domains, *J. Analyse Math.,* **30** (1976), 172–199.
11. P. Hästö, The Apollonian metric: uniformity and quasiconvexity, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. Math.,* **28** (2003), 385–414.
12. J. Heinonen, Quasiconformal mappings onto John domains, *Rev. Math. Iber.,* **5** (1989), 97–123.
13. J. Heinonen, Quasiconformal distortion on arcs, *J. Analyse Math.,* **63** (1994), 19–53.
14. J. Heinonen and P. Koskela, Definitions of quasiconformality, *Invent. Math.,* **120** (1995), 61–79.
15. J. Heinonen and P. Koskela, Quasiconformal maps in metric spaces with controlled geometry, *Acta Math.,* **181** (1998), 1–61.
16. J. Heinonen and S. Rohde, The Gehring-Hayman inequality for quasihyperbolic geodesics, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.,* **114** (1993), 393–405.
17. M. Huang and Y. Li, Decomposition properties of John domains in real normed vector spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **388** (2012), 191-197.
18. M. Huang, Y. Li, S. Ponnusamy and X. Wang, The quasiconformal subinvariance property of John domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and its application, Submitted.
19. F. John, Rotation and strain, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.,* **14** (1961), 391–413.
20. P. W. Jones, Extension theorems for BMO, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.,* **29** (1980), 41–66.
21. P. W. Jones, Quasiconformal mappings and extendability of functions in Sobolev spaces, *Acta Math.,* **147** (1981), 71–88.
22. K. Kim and N. Langmeyer, Harmonic measure and hyperbolic distance in John disks, *Math. Scand.,* **83** (1998), 283–299.
23. Y. Li and X. Wang, Unions of John domains and uniform domains in real normed vector spaces, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. Math.,* **35** (2010), 627–632.
24. O. Martio, Definitions of uniform domains, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.,* **5** (1980), 197–205.
25. O. Martio and J. Sarvas, Injectivity theorems in plane and space, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.,* **4** (1978), 383–401.
26. R. Näkki and B. Palka, Lipschitz conditions and quasiconformal mappings, *Indiana. Univ. Math. J.,* **29** (1980), 41–66.
27. R. Näkki and J. Väisälä, John disks, *Expo. Math.,* **9** (1991), 3–43.
28. Ch. Pommerenke, One-sided smoothness conditions and conformal mapping, *J. London Math. Soc.,* **26** (1982), 77–88.
29. P. Tukia and J. Väisälä, Quasisymmetric embeddings of metric spaces, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.,* **5** (1980), 97-114.
30. J. Tyson, Quasiconformality and quasisymmetry in metric measure spaces, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.,* **23** (1998), 525-548.
31. J. Väisälä, Lectures on n-dimensional quasiconformal mappings, *Springer-Verlag*, 1971.
32. J. Väisälä, Quasimöbius maps, *J. Analyse Math.,* **44** (1985), 218–234.
33. J. Väisälä, Homeomorphism of bounded length distortion, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.,* **12** (1987), 303–312.
34. J. Väisälä, Quasiconformal maps of cylindrical domains, *Acta Math.,* **162** (1989), 201–225.

35. J. Väisälä, Free quasiconformality in Banach spaces. I, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.,* **15** (1990), 355-379.
36. J. Väisälä, Free quasiconformality in Banach spaces. II, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.,* **16** (1991), 255–310.
37. J. Väisälä, Free quasiconformality in Banach spaces. III, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.,* **17** (1992), 393–408.
38. J. Väisälä, Free quasiconformality in Banach spaces. IV, *Analysis and Topology, 697–717, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, N. J.,* 1998.
39. J. Väisälä, Relatively and inner uniform domains, *Conformal Geom. Dyn.,* **2** (1998), 56–88.
40. J. Väisälä, The free quasiworld: freely quasiconformal and related maps in Banach spaces. *Quasiconformal geormetry and dynamics* (*Lublin* 1996)*, Banach Center Publications, Vol. 48, Polish Academy of Science, Warsaw*, 1999, 55–118.
41. M. Vuorinen, Conformal invariants and quasiregular mappings, *J. Analyse Math.,* **45** (1985), 69–115.
42. M. Vuorinen, Conformal geometry and quasiregular mappings (Monograph, 208 pp.). Lecture Notes in Math. Vol. 1319, Springer-Verlag, 1988.

M. Huang, Department of Mathematics, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan 410081, People's Republic of China
E-mail address: `mzhuang79@yahoo.com.cn`

S. Ponnusamy, Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai-600 036, India.
E-mail address: `samy@iitm.ac.in`

A. Rasila, Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University, FI-00076 Aalto, Finland
E-mail address: `antti.rasila@iki.fi`

X. Wang, Department of Mathematics, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan 410081, People's Republic of China
E-mail address: `xtwang@hunnu.edu.cn`